

THE
PRINCESS OF WALES
SARASVATI BHAVANA STUDIES



EDITED BY
GOPI NATHA KAVIRAJA

682
KAY

—
Vol. III.
—

Printed by Rameshwari Pathak, at the Tara Printing Works,
Benares and published under the authority of the Government
of the United Provinces by the Superintendent of the
Government Press, Allahabad.

—
GOVERNMENT SANSKRIT LIBRARY,
BENARES.

—
1921.

CONTENTS

Papers		Pages.
I. INDEX TO SABARA'S BHĀSYA :		
By the late Col. G. A. Jacob	...	1—39
II. STUDIES IN HINDU LAW :		
By Gaṅgā Nātha Jīā	...	41—65
III. THEISM IN ANCIENT INDIA :		
By Gopī Nātha Kavirāja	...	67—77
IV. HISTORY AND BIBLIOGRAPHY OF NYĀYA		
VAIŚEŚIKA LITERATURE : By Gopī Nātha Kavirāja	79—157
V. NAISADHA AND SRI HARSA :		
By Nilakumala Bhattachārya	159—191
VI. INDIAN DRAMATURGY.		
By P. N. Patankar, M. A.		195—200

I INDEX TO BOOKS I—VI OF SABARA'S BHĀSYA
i (Bib Ind Edn)

By THE LATE LOL G A JACOB

[Continued from *The S B Studies*, Vol II, P 28]

खादिर्, 667—8, 671—2

" खननं पुरोपां [वेदिं] प्रतिष्ठाकामस्य "

(Cf Āpast Śrauta, 2 3 5 6), 504

खालि, oil cake, 307

" खादिरं चीर्यकामस्य यूर्वं etc ", 488, 490, 493

" खादिरे [पशु] वधनाति etc , 466 493 667

गर्गा शतं दण्ड्यन्ताम्, 223

गर्भदास, a slave by birth, 208

" गर्भाएषेषु व्राह्मणमुपनयीत ", 651

" गर्भिणयो भवन्ति " (T S 2 1 2 6) 446 For a new theory
as to the meaning of this see Dr Barnett's notice of a
book in J R A S 1909, p 473

गवामयनं, a sacrificial session, the performance of which
lasts a year (Satyap iv 6 2 and note to vii 1 2 1)
713, 759

" गायत्र्या त्वा शताक्षरया संदधीत ", 680

गाहैपत्यन्याय, 246

गुणवाद, "a statement meant figuratively" (MW), "indirect
application (Jhā),—45

गुणधिधि, injunction of a secondary matter, 95, 87—90, 108.

गुणानां च परार्थत्वादसम्बन्ध समव्याप्त्यात् (Sutra 3 1 22)

Cowell translates thus in Śāṅkilya Sutra i 19 (p 26),—
'subsidiary portions of a sacrifice stand as such on the
same level and so cannot be connected with each of her'.
"गुणत्वगत्वाद्य, etc , 647, 650

- "गृहीतान्त्रहानृत्विज आददते etc " 346 Apast. Sr 1.16.3
 "गोदोहेन पशुकामस्य प्रणयेत्",—370, 436, 491, 502.
 गौण, defined, 243 6 (See too p 101)
 प्रहं चा गृहीत्वा चमसं चा उन्नीय स्तोत्रमुपाकरोति ', 535
 प्रहैकत्वन्याय (See Maxims),—224
 "प्रामकामो यजेत्", 640
 ग्रावस्तुत, one of the 10 priests at an Agnistoma sacrifice—the extoller of the stones for pressing the soma plants (See Eggeling's notes on Satap 1 8 1 21, and iv 3 3 1) —353
 घटीयन्त्र, 541
 घृतं शिरसि निहितं मनुष्याणा सुखकरमेव, 318
 "घृत देवानामस्तु पितृणा, etc 317 (T S 6 1 1 4)
 चक्रवाकस्तनी . नदी, 61
 "चक्षुर्विमित आदध्पात्", 624 (T B 1 1 4 1 reads निमित्)
 "चक्षुपी चा पतौ यज्ञस्य यदाज्यभागी" (T S 2 6 2 1) —487,530
 "चतुर्गृहीत चा पतदभूत्", 463
 "चतुर्गृहीतं जुहोति" (T S 5 1 1 1),345
 "चतुर्गृहीतान्याज्यानि भवन्ति etc ", 460, 464
 "चतुर्जुहां गृह्णाति", (T B 3 3 64), 461
 "चतुर्थोत्तमयो प्रतिसमानयति", 542
 "चतुर्दशपाणीमास्यामाहृतय हृयन्ते ", 442, 534
 चतुर्धार्करण, dividing into 4 parts, 676
 " चतुर्विशतिमान हिरण्यं दीक्षणीयायाम्" 536
 चतुर्होत्र formulas, so called from four priests (Agnidh, Adhvaryu Hotri and Upavaktri) being mentioned in them (Satap iv, 6 9 18 and note), 390 762
 " चतुर्होत्रा पौर्णमासीमभिमृशेत् etc " (cf Apast 2 11 5), 390, 533
 "चत्वारे है महायज्ञा etc , 526
 ' चमसांश्चमसाध्वर्यचे प्रयच्छति ", 357, 409
 चमसाध्वर्यु (Satap ii 2 1 29 and foot note), 357, 348—9, 409.

“चमसाध्यगुंबृणीते”, 398.

चमसिन् (See Eggeling's note on Satap. iv.2.1.31),—349, 356.

चपाल, a 'head-piece'-a ring on the top of the यूप, generally of wood, but occasionally of Dongh. (See Eggeling's note to 3.7.1.3 and 5.2.10. In the *Vedic Index* it is defined as "the monstar-shaped top-piece of the sacrificial post"),—528.
चातुर्मास्यानि, the 3 four-monthly or seasonal sacrifices (Satap. 2.5.1) (See *Vedic Index*).—96,157.

चात्वाल, the pit from which the earth has been taken to form the high altar, and into which the कृष्णविपाण etc. are *thrown* on the conclusion of a sacrifice (See Eggeling on Satap. 3. 5. 1. 26), 478.

“चात्वाले कृष्णविपाणं प्रास्यति” (T. S. vi. 1. 3. 8. and Satap. 4. 4. 5. 2), 478, 638.

चारुसंख्याः (कादम्बाः), 33.

“चित्पतिस्त्वा पुनात् etc.” (T. S. 1. 2. 1. 2), 135.

“चित्रया येज्ञत पशुकामः,” 87, 506 (T. S. 2. 4. 6. 1).

चित्रापूर्णमास of T. S. 7. 4. 8. 2. refd. to as चैत्रीपौर्णमासी—713, 714.

“चित्रिणीरूपदधाति ”, 573—5.

चोदक, a codaka—text enforces the performance, of a function along with its subordinate parts' (Kunte on 3. 7. 51 and 5. 1. 17), 411, 547.

चोदना = क्रियाया अभिधायकं च (क्षयम्), 108, 691, 701 (in these 2 sūtras Kunte renders it 'an original statement'. Should it not rather be 'originative' ?).

**चोदना भूतं भवन्तं भविष्यन्तं...एवं जातीयकमर्थं एकोत्यवग-
मायितुम्**, 4. (Quoted in Nyāyamañjari, p. 135).

चैत्रिन्याय, 105.

छाग may mean अश्व 'having the Jagat as its Sāma'—168, (Āpast. Śrauta xii. 14. 1).

जंजश्यमान (जमु to yawn), 321—2. (See T.S. 2. 5. 2. 4).

जन्मान्तरानुभूतं न स्मर्यते, 65

२ जरद्रव, 38, 498

"जरामर्यं वा पतत्सत्रं यदग्निहोत्रं", 194, 196

जाघनी, the tail of an animal (as used in Satap 3 8 5 6
it is said by the purvapakṣin to stand for the whole
animal—एकदेशत्वात्),—299

"जाघन्या पद्मी. संयाजर्यन्ति", 299 (Satap 3 8 5 6 'they per-
form the Patnisamy ajas with the tail (of the victim)' See
too Eggeling's note in Vol I pp 75 & 256)

जातस्य पुत्रस्य कीडनकं, 564 (In ४ ३ ५ we have यस्य नास्ति
पुत्रो न तस्य पुत्रस्य कीडनकानि क्रियन्ते)

जातेष्टिन्याय, 511

जात्यन्ध, 4, 64 65 (जात्यन्धानामिव चचनं रूपविशेषेषु), p 4 The
Vedic Index omits this sense of जामि altogether See
J R A S , 1914, pp 301 732

जामितादोष, 145 The fault of repetition, sameness, similarity
In Satap 1 3 2 8 Eggeling renders जामि 'a repetition and
— in 1 6 3 2 7 'sameness and 'repetition' On this latter
passage Sayana says —

"एकरूपं यद्वस्तुद्वयं तद्विलक्षणेन वस वन्तरेणाव्यवहितं
तद्वयव्यानेन तद्वस्तु जामि भवति'

In Nirukta iv 20 (Vol 2, p 460, and ५ 16 (Vol 4, p 67)

जामि is said to have the three meanings भगिनी, यालिश,
and पुमरक्त

See too Sabara on ५ 8 63 where he explains जामि by सावश्य

See too Bhāmati pp 77 and 642

"जामि चा पतयहस्य क्रियते यदन्वच्चौ पुरोडाईौ, उपांगुयाजमभरा
यजत्यजामिवाय" (T S 2 6 6 4),—144 Sayana's bhasya
on this mantra is as follows — 'यदन्वच्चौ उपक्रमगता
वाग्नेयाऽग्नीपोषीयपुरोडाईौ स्यातामेतेन यजस्य जामि आल
स्याय क्रियेत । अत आलस्यपरिहाराय तयोः पुरोडाशयोमेंध्ये
उपांगुयाजं यजेत'

In the *bhāṣya* on Ait. Br. iii. 47, (Vol. 2, p 225), viz. "जामि वा एतद्ये कियने यत्र समानीश्यामृगभ्यां समानेऽहन्य-जतीति," Sāyana again explains जामि by आलस्य, but adds "प्रयुक्तयोरेवर्शयोः पुनः प्रयोगस्य चर्वितचर्वणसहशत्वेनाऽनु-चितत्वात्" but Haug translates it 'laziness.'

On p. 669 of Jhā's translation of *Tantravārtika* (2. 2. 10) we read :—"When it so happens that between the offering of 2 cakes there is no other action to be performed, then we have the flow of jāmi [i. e जामितादोष] and hence the mention of the removal of jāmi [i. e. अजामित्व] must be taken as enlogizing that action which would be laid down as to be performed between the 2 offerings and from this it follows that, in the case in question, what has to be enlogized is the sacrifice *Upāmsu* which is distinctly laid down as to be performed in the interim [अन्तरा]."

The *Nyāyasudhā* on 2. 2. 10 says :—

जामि वा इत्युक्तम् । सोदर्यवाचि जामिशब्दलक्षितस्य सादृ-
श्यस्य नैरान्तर्यानुष्टुने सत्यालस्यायापादकन्वेन दोपत्यात् etc.
जायमानस्य पुरुपस्य अग्ने शिरोजायते मध्ये मध्यं पश्चात्पादौ, 534.
'जायमानो हृ धै ग्राहणस्त्रिभिर्ब्रह्मणवा जायते etc.' (T.S. 6. 3.
10 5), 651—2.

"जीर्यन्ति वा एष आहितः पशु. etc" (cf. T.S. 1. 5. 7. 3), 371.

ब्रह्म, This spoon and after sacrificial implements to be the common property of a'7 who are performing a *satra* (see Jhā's *Prabh. Mīmānsā*, p. 210), 738—9.

ज्ञाहोति (=होम), defined as distinguished from यजति (=याग).

For the different characteristics of the 2, see Index to Jhā, S. V. होम,— 484.

जैमिनि, named in sutra,—210,654.

षातसम्बन्धमैकदेशदर्शनादेकदेशान्तरेऽसन्निगृहेऽथेऽबुद्धिः (cf. एकसम्बन्धिदर्शने etc. in Maxims iii),—10.

ज्येष्ठो वा एष ग्रहाणां etc" (T.S. 3 5 9.1), 520.

"ज्योतिष्टोमेन स्वर्गकामो यजेत्", 598, 604, 620, 635

तत्प्रत्यन्याय, the principle that there is another scripture declaratory of it (viz of the deity, the materials etc, of a sacrifice), 89

"तत्र तत्त्वैवं कामा सत्रमुवेयु," 634

"तत्र तद्द्यादपूर्वस्मिन्दास्यन्त्यात्," 724

"तत्रोत्कृष्टं वै अपरिमितम्," 753

तदादितद-तन्याय, 550

"तद्यस्येभ्यो हविर्भ्यं समवद्यति," 345, 456

तदूद्यपदेशन्याय—'The principle of a *Name indicating resemblance to something*' So my rendering in *Maxims* in Kunte translates

the Sutra 145 'तद्वचपदेशं च) by "Again well known resemblances determine the name of a Sacrifice and explains व्यपदेश by सादृश्य In his translation, Jha renders the Sutra it points to the Action', but in his *Mritamata Sutra* in Sacred Books of the Hindus, his rendering is 'That also [should be taken as Name] which points to a similarity [between the sacrifice and the accessory that it would indicate]' For Colebrooke's view see *Maxims* in 90

तनूनपात्रहण, 726 729

तन्त्र (See under आदाप in Index to Jhā, and Kunte on 5
2 13) —562, 568—9

त-गलोप, 773

"तप्ते पयसि दध्यानयति etc, 157, 449

"तमङ्गनकि," Satap 3139 "शुरेणीक्यानकि", ditto 31313
—413

"तं पराव्चमुक्तेभ्यो विगृह्णाति," 555 See this as an adjective
in Tandyā व्या 7 2

तरसपुरोडाश, a cake composed of meat 433

"तस्माज्जंजभ्यमानोऽनुशूयात् etc (T S 25 24),—322

"तस्मात्पितृभ्य. पूर्वेषु करोति", 496, 499 (T S 25 3 6
with क्रियते)

"तस्मात्पूपा प्रपिष्टभोगोऽदन्तको हि सः" (T. S. 2, 6. 8. 5, and see Kunte on 3. 3. 41), 305, 308.

'तस्मादीच्छितो न ददाति न पचाति न जुहोति' 716.

"तस्मान्मैत्रावरुणं प्रेष्याति चानु चाह", 407—8.

"तस्य द्वादशशतं दक्षिणा," 391.

"तानुचिष्ठत ओपधयो वनस्पतयोऽनूचिष्ठन्ति", (T.S.7.4.8.3),—715.

"तान्पर्यभिकृतानुत्सृजति," 457.

"तान्पुरोऽध्यर्थुर्विभजति etc.", 397.

"तान्स वपद्कर्त्रं हरति," 410.

"तिक्ष आहुतीजुहोति" (T. S. 2. 3. 9. 3), 368.

"तिक्ष एव साहस्र्योपसदो द्वादशाहीनस्य" (T. S. 6. 2. 5. 1),—296, 324.

तिक्षो दीक्षाः," 391, 712.

"तीर्थं वै प्रातः सघनं etc.", 458.

तुरडपित्थौ, N. of 2 men (cf. डित्थडवित्थ in Sankara's bhāṣya on 2. 4. 20), 730.

"तुरडमोत्रे दीथताम्", 'let it be given to Tunda's mother' (though she may also be the mother of डपित्थ),—730.

तुम्ब, the 'nave' of a wheel (So Molesworth only!).

"शोभनमस्य चक्रस्य नेमितुम्बारम्,"—99.

तुलयेगित्व, 'equal applicability', 134.

तूपर (=शृंगरहित. See Sāyana on T. S. vii, 5. 1. 2),—40, 154. (See *Vedic Index*).

तूष्णीं होम, 577.

"तेजः संस्तवो ग्राहणस्य etc," 731.

"तेनावभृथं यन्ति," 480.

त्रयीविद्यः, 'knowing 3 Vedas', 279.

"त्रिधा तु पश्चात् तु वेदोऽस्तुणाति," 429.

"त्रिवृदगिनप्तुदगिनष्टोमः etc.", 162.

"त्रिवृद्यहिष्पवमानं पञ्चदशान्याज्यानि", 535.

- "त्रिरातं धीश्व देवान्", the 33 gods,— (R V 369),—271
 "त्रीणि ह वे यजस्योदराणि etc , 573
 "त्रीयेतानि हर्वीषि भवन्ति etc , 522 (T S V 517)
 'त्रीन् ललामान्',— Three with marks , 444 (cf त्रयः कृष्णललामाः of T S 5620)
 "त्रेधा तएहुलान्विभजेत्" 708—9 (T S 2552)
 त्रयिंश्च 'having 3 sacred ancestors , 629
 "दक्षिणस्य हविर्धीनस्याधस्ताश्चार उपरवाः etc , 427 [Apastamba Śrauta xi 11 1]
 "दक्षिण सोमस्य," 391
 "दक्षिणे हविर्धीने सोममासादयति", 394
 दण्डकलितपत् 'like the measuring [of a piece of ground] with a stick' (See Com on Apast Śrauta xi 126 and my note in J R & S for 1912, p 744], 569 [& Vol 2, p 521]
 'दण्डी प्रैपानन्वाह' 479
 "दण्डेन दीक्षयति," 578
 ददाति (=दान), defined as the actual 'transfer to another of the thing given, 484
 "दधनि चर्हं शृते चर्हम", 710 (T S 3591)
 "दध्ना जुहोति," 494
 "दध्नेन्द्रियकामस्य जुहुयात्," 493
 "दध्यरासि etc ", 283 (T. S 1616)
 "दर्भमयं वासो भवति" 772
 "दर्भमयी रशना भवति" (Satap VIII 112),—378
 दर्विहोम, an oblation made with a ladle or 'an oblation of a *darvi*: spoonful of boiled rice to Indra and may be considered as part of the Grīhamedhiyā isti, being, as it were an offering of remains , like all *Jahs*: offerings, the *darvihoma* is performed by the *Adhvaryu* while seated on the north side of the fire ' [Eggeling's note on Satap II 5317],—762,
 दर्शन=उच्चारण in 1118 (p 29), the utterance (of a word)'
 दर्शपूर्णमासन्याय, 504

"दर्शपूर्णमासाभ्यां स्वर्गकामो यजेत्" 598,604,607,620,635,682,
697.

"दर्शपूर्णमासाभ्यामिष्टा सोमेन यजेत्" (T. S. 2.5.6.1),—195,
526,597: with दर्शपूर्णमासौ etc., 510,737.

"दर्शो चा एतयोः पूर्वं, etc." 532.

"दश चमसाधर्यदः etc." 399,

दश दाढिमानि an example of अनुपपन्नाधर्यचन.—13,497 (an
अनर्यकवचन). [Mahābhāṣya vol 1. p. 38].

दशमुष्टिपरिमित सोम, 152—3; 303.

"दशमुष्टिभिर्मीते," 302.

"दशयह्नायुधानि" (T. S. 1.0.8.3),—214. (See under यह्नायुध).

"दशापवित्रेण ग्रहं संमार्द्दिः" 225,230, 378. (See ग्रहैकत्वन्याय
in *Maxims*, iii).

दाक्षायण्यह्न, a peculiar modification of the new and full moon
sacrifices originated by the Dāksayānas—a royal family.
[See Śatap. 2.4.4 and Eggeling's long note at the beginning
of it.]—179,180.

दानदोमपाकाः, 716.

दाशतय, ten-fold, relating to R. V. with its 10 mayḍalas,—258.

दीक्षणीयेष्टि, 'consecration offering',— (Eggeling on Satapatha
3.1.3),—383,535,566.

"दीक्षाः सोमस्य," 391.

"He cuts (a tree for) a sacrificial post at the time of
initiations" (Kunte).

"दीक्षासु यूपं छिनत्ति," 551. Cf Āpast. Śrauta X. 4.14 (with
कारयात्).

दीर्घसोम=सोमयागविरोप (Mādhwā), 301.

"दीर्घसोमे स-तृत्याद्भृत्या" (T. S. 6.2.11.3), 301.

"तुर्यर्णवस्य भ्रातुच्य," (T. B. 2.2.4.6), 326.

तुर्येषु हि प्रानं मित्या, 8.

"दत्तिनवनीतमाज्यम्", 'butter consisting of butter [long-stored]
in a boat'—¹ {for use at a श्रेत्रे = sacrifice},—431.

दृष्टे हि तस्यार्थः कर्मवयोधनं नाम,—2.

'We see that its [i. e. the veda's] object is the laying down and enjoining of a certain action. [Quoted in Śankara's bhāṣya, vol 1, p. 49]

देवदत्तः प्रातरपूर्णं भक्षयति etc , 548.

"देवस्य त्वा सावेतुः प्रसवे" (T. S. 1.8 7.2), 7.1 11 1, 132.

"देवा ऋषयो गन्धर्वास्तेऽन्यत आसन् etc " (Cf. T. S. 2.4.1.1),—523.

देवानां प्रिय, 684.

"देवा है देवयजनमध्यवसाय etc.,," 39 (T. S. 6.1.5.1).

"देवा है शम्यं चार्हस्पत्यमनुवन् etc.,," 324 (T. S. 2.6.10 1).

"देवा है सत्रमासत्" (T. S. 1.6.1.3), 605 6.

"देवा है स्विष्टकृतमनुवन् हृवयं नो वहेति," 338, 342, 455.

"देवेभ्यो वनस्पते हृवीपि etc.,," 79 (T. B. 3.6,11.2).

"दैवतान्यवदाय etc.,," 562.

द्रव्यसंस्कार, 'preparatory operations performed on Sacrificial Substance's (Kunte), 427.

"द्वादशदीक्षा," 712. See X. 2 27.

"द्वादशरात्रीदीनितो भृति चन्वीत," 'should procure food (by begging),—713,771.

"द्वादश हृत् रात्रयः संवत्सरस्य प्रतिमा," 760.

द्वादशहृत is the amount of daksinā to be given to a priest at the Jyotiṣṭoma,—412,749—59.

"द्वादशाहेन प्रजाकामेन याजयेत्," 634.

"द्विरैन्द्रवायवस्य भक्षयति etc.,," 348.

"द्विर्विष्पोऽवदानं," 336,559.

"द्विवचनवहुवचनान्तानामसमाप्त," 757.

द्विरेप, 'having a remainder twice' (from soma being poured into a cup twice without its being washed). See Kunte's note,—267.

"द्विष्टानि वाक्यानि," 'ambiguous sentences', (Mahābhāṣya, vol. i, p. 14, and Nāgess'a, vol i, p. 51),—492,493 (singular).

द्वैयदकाल्य, 'belonging to 2 days,—595.

द्वचवदान, 'cutting off two' (pieces of the Puroङ्का) a double oblation (Kunte), 336, 674, 676—7.

"द्वचवदानं करोति," 336.

"द्वचवदानं जुहोति," 674.

"द्वचदं नाशनाति etc., " 415.

"द्वचदं साकमेधैः," 549.

द्वचाम्नाता मन्त्राः, mantras which appear in the Veda,—419.

"धर्मप्रजासम्पन्ने दारे नान्यां कुर्वीत" (Smriti), 768.

धर्म प्रति विप्रतिपन्ना वद्विदः—'There is great difference of opinion among learned men in regard to Duty',—3.

"धर्मे चार्थं च कामे च नातिचरितव्या (स्त्री)," 611—12,767-8.

धायया, certain Rik verses, 570. See Kunte on 5.3.5.

धार्मिक, defined as one who offers sacrifice, 5.

धृष्णा, a spoon for ghee (See Eggeling's note, vol i, p. 67),—342, 388,477.

"न कलञ्जं भक्षितव्यं न लगुनं etc., " 644.

"न केसरिणेऽददाति न उभयतोदतः प्रतिगृह्णाति" (केसरिन् = अश्व,, 744.

नक्षेपेति (See Index to Jha), 564.

न च फलसे उपपथमाने कल्पयः शफयः कल्पयितुम्, 414.

न च हृष्टे कारणे सत्यदृष्टं कल्पयितुं शक्यते, 11.

न च पदार्था एव वाक्यार्थः etc., 32.

न च स्तिग्धस्य स्नेहानं छतम्, 459.

"न तानयन्ति etc" (R.V. vi.28.3), 124.

नदीयगस्थानीय, 717.

नद्यास्तीरे फलानि, 4.

"न पिता धर्थते न माता etc., " 428.

न पुनरुक्ता मदान्दोषः, 476.

"न प्रथमयने प्रवृंज्यात् etc., " 304 (See Eggeling on 3.4.4.1).

"नर्तु स प्रतीक्षेष्व नक्षत्रम्," 592.

- नवनीत, 431—2
 “नवनीतेनाभ्युक्ते,” (T S 6 11 5), 318
 “नव प्रयाजा इज्यन्ते नवानुयाजा” (T B 1 6 3 3),—568
 नष्टाश्वदधरथ्याय, 109 (Mahābhāṣya, vol 1, p 125)
 न सप्तदशावरा. कलसमवाये भवेयु ,” 665
 न सर्पायाहृलिं दद्यात् , 646
 न हि कपाले नष्टे तदन्वेषणार्था इष्टिर्युक्ता, 512
 न हि काकिन्यां नष्टायां etc , 512
 न हि निन्दा निन्द्यं निन्दितुं प्रयुज्यते etc , 203
 न हि मन्दविषेण धृश्चिकेनाऽपि दष्ट etc , 185
 न हि वचनशतेनाप्यनारभ्योऽर्थे. etc , 215.
 न हि सज्जि वाससि वा भिन्ने etc , 658
 न ह्यकृते प्रयोजने कश्चित्प्रतिपादयितुमर्हति, 356
 न ह्याश्वातेर्य कश्चिहृदिमुपलभते,—⁹ (Quoted in Nyāyamañjari,
 pp 17,162)
 न ह्यनभिघाय मुख गौणमभिघदति शब्द , 245
 न ह्यन्यस्य वितथमायेऽन्यस्य वैतद्यं भवितुमर्हति, 5
 न ह्यप्रतीते विषेषणे विशिष्टं केचन प्रत्येतुमर्हन्ति, 82
 न ह्यप्राप्तस्य प्रतिषेध , 629 (T S 6 3 1 5)
 “नाध्यर्युरुपगायेत्” 401
 नानावीजेषि, a Sacrifice at which various kinds of grain are
 used, 562
 “नानूतं यदेत्” (T S 2 5 5 6), 318,440
 “नान्यस्य स्वरूपुर्यात् etc ,” 467
 नामधेय, name (of a Sacrifice etc),—86,87,89—91,96,108
 नामानि, defined in sutra 2 1 3 —
 “Such words, on the utterance of which, the forms of the
 objects denoted are directly cognized, are nouns” (Jha).
 नामिक ‘relating to a name or noun
 (पर्यां धिभक्तयो नामिक्य उच्यन्ते), 111.
 नाराशंसकल्प, 726—9

[“Nārāśamsa, ‘pertaining to Nārāśamsa (man’s praise, i. e Agni, or Soma, or the Fathers),’ is the name given to certain remains of soma-libations sacred to the Fathers, which in the nine soma cups, are temporarily deposited under the axle of the southern soma-cart, till they are drunk by the priests at the end of the libation.” Eggeling on 3 6.2.25].

नारिए होम, 564 (also X 401). See नक्षत्रेष्टि in Index to Jhā.

नावनीत, freshly-boiled butter, 96

“नासोमयाजी संश्रयेत्” (T. S. 2 5.5.1), 596.

“नास्या अश्वमयात्” (T. S. 2.5 1.6). 325-6.

नाहित दृष्टुपपन्नम्, 17.

निगद, the name of certain yajuṣ mantras which being addressed to others are recited *loudly* (See under मन्त्र in the Index to Jhā),—129,131,292.

निधन, the final or concluding word of a Sāman, to be sung in chorus by the Prastotar, Udgātar, and Pratihartar (See Eggeling’s long note on iv. 2 5.10). हीप् is the *nidhana* at the end of सौभरसाम to be sung by one desiring rain, 165—6.

निनयन, pouring out of Sacrificial water, [See Śatap 1 9.2.32. 33, and Kunte’s note on 4 2 14], 477

नियोगत., necessarily, of necessity, 643

निरालम्बन, ‘without support (i. e ideas without external objects—the निरालम्बनवाद or Idealism of the Buddhists),—8.

निर्मन्त्य, ‘fire produced by friction’ to be taken in its literal sense in vedic texts,—96

निविद्, N. of short detached formulas inserted in a liturgy etc. (See Eggeling’s note on 1.4 2.1. and translation of iii.9).

“नियीतं मनुप्याणं etc ,” (T. S 2.11.1), 312.

निवृत्ति, cessation of application (in opp to प्रवृत्ति. See Kunte on 3 7.12), 392.

"निवेशुनं संगमनो वसूनां etc." (V. S. XII 66. See गार्हपत्यन्याय in *Maxims*, III),—246

निपादस्थपतिन्याय, 632.

निष्क्रय, 'buying off'—a ransom, an equivalent (the स्वरु being thrown into the sacrificial fire instead of the शूप)—529, 694.

"नीचैःसदो मिनुयात्", 417, 505.

नीलकौशेयसंवीताः (कादम्बाः) ('geese clothed in black silk garments'), 33

"नीलोत्पलवतेष्वद्य चरतश्चारुसंरथाः" 33, 35.

नीवारः, a substitute for व्रीहि.—381—2,657,659,666,672.

नेमपिष्ट, half of flour (a certain चरु), 308—310.

"नोमे नयन्ति ऋभवो यथा,"—632 (R. V. VIII. 75,5).

नेष्ट्रीया, verses to be recited by the Nestā priest.

(T.B. 3. 12. 9. 5),—407, 421.

नैचाशाखं नाम नगरं etc., 58. [See RV. 3. 53 14, where Griffith renders it 'low-born.' Others take it as the name of a place. See *Vedic Index*. It gives a wrong reference to R. V.]

"नोद्यन्तमादियमीद्वेत नास्तं यन्तम्", 439, 645, 689

"पञ्चदश सामिधेनीरःवाह" (T. S. 2. 5 82)—369. This is referred to as पांचदश्य, T.B. 3 12. 9. 8.

* पञ्च पञ्चाशतस्त्रिवृत्तः संवत्सरा etc., 755.

"पञ्चप्रयाजान्यजति" (Cf. T. S. 2. 6. 1. 4), 368.

पञ्चशुराव, 'consisting of 5 cupfuls', 683-5, 690, 701, 703.

पञ्चहोत्रु (cf. चतुर्होत्रु),—390.

पञ्चानां त्वा घातानां यन्त्राय धर्त्रीय गृह्णामि" (T. S. 1. 6. 1. 2),—419.

पञ्चावत्त, 'five times cut off or taken up'. See Eggeling's note on पञ्चावत्तीय in vol. 3, p. 48),—754.

"पञ्चावत्तं जमृदग्नीनाम्," 754.

पञ्चिगणक, an officer appointed to count the infantry (?), 102.

पक्षीसंयाजा , 299 (see Index to Jha)

“पक्षी वै परिणायस्य ईष्टे etc 612 (Cf TS 6 2 1 1)

“पक्षी सन्नद्ध आज्येनोदेहि,” 423

पदकर्मन्, the action connected with the 7 stakes taken by the cow to be given for purpose of soma (See Satap 3 3 1 Kunte renders this “crusing the cow to walk”), 451

पदपांशु, the dust from the seventh foot print of the सोमऋग्यणी which is scraped up by the priest with his own hands and sprinkled on the axles of the soma carts (See Madhavi and Satap 3 3 1), 451

पदवास्यार्थन्यायविद्, an epithet given to the author of a verse on विधि, 490

पदानि स्तं स्वं पदार्थमभिघाय निवृत्तव्यापाराणि, etc 34

पदार्थनुसमयन्याय, 557

“पद्यु वा पतत् श्मशानं यच्छ्रद् ,” 626 (“A walking cemetery”, quoted in the Vedanta Sutra bhasy 1 1 3 38 Compare Vaśishtha's Dharmasastra xviii 11, that of Āpastumba 1,3 9 9)

“पद्यसा मैत्रावस्थं श्रीणाति” (See मैत्रावस्थं etc)

पद्यस्या, a dish of curds offered to Mitra and Varuna (Eggeling on 2 4 4 14), 477

पयोव्रत, ‘the living on milk alone, of the sacrificer and his wife during the performance of a Jyotishtoma , 772

“पयोव्रतं ग्राह्यस्य” (T S 6 2 5 3), 495, 623, 772

परक्रिया (कृति), one of the many kinds of Brahman (as distinguished from Mantra) ‘A description of something done previously by a single person Transn Tantravartika on 2 1 33 p 572)—127, 753, 755

“पररथैर्वा एते स्वर्गे लाकं यन्ति येऽनाहिताग्नय सत्रमासते,” 737

“परा वा एतस्यायु प्राण पति याऽग्नुं गृह्णाति ” (T S 3 3 4 2),—573

परिक्रिय, hire, wages hiring engaging for wages,—339—40
396, 412

परिक्रीत, hired, engagied —397

परिचारकत्व, the position of attendant i. e. one of subordination,—742, 745.

परिधि, the name given to the 3 logs of wood placed on the north, south, and west sides of the altar [Eggeling, Vol 1, p 87, calls them 'enclosing sticks'. See Kātyāyana Śrauta ii. 221, p 172],—118, 509—10

परिभाषितव्य, 'to be regarded as having a technical signification',—1.

परिभोजनीयवर्हिष्पु, unconsecrated (i. e. असंस्कृत) grass,—429. "[पवित्रनिष्पाच्चिरपि शास्त्रीयलवनादिसंस्कारयहितैः परिभोजनीयनामकैदर्भेः संपादनीया]"—Mādhaba; "असंस्कृतादेव पवित्रादि कार्यम्"—Sāstradipikā].

"**परिधीर्णस**" (T. S. 1. 3. 6. 2],—422.

"**परिव्याणं कृत्वोपाकरेति पशुम्**," 527.

परिसंख्या, 402, 676—7.

परिसंख्यायां स्वार्थहाने परार्थकल्पना प्राप्तवाभृच्, 402.

परीष्टि=**परीक्षा** in Sutra 1. 1. 3.

परोक्तं प्रत्यक्षस्य वाधकं न भवति, 438.

पर्यग्निकरण, carrying fire round a sacrificial animal (Satap. 3. 8. 1. 6),—115, 118. Also waving fire etc. round the head of a returned traveller 1—117 [See Eggeling's long note on 1. 2. 2. 13]

"**पर्यग्निरूतं पाञ्चीवतमुत्खजति**" (T. S. 6. 6. 6. 1),—187.

पर्याप्ति, the third and concluding part of the Bahispatayamāna stotra (Kunte, 5. 3. 7), 571—2.

पर्युदास, 'exclusion' (of the Sūdra), 624.

पर्वद् (=परिपद्), 'an assembly,' 'society,' 634.

पवमानेष्टि, an oblation to Agni payamāna (Satap. 2. 2. 1. 6, and see Eggeling's long note. Also T.B. 1. 1. 5. 10, and Kunte on 3. 6. 11), 370—2, 431, 576.

पवित्र, the purificatory ceremony at the commencement of a राजसूय,—516. (See note on Satap. 5. 2. 3. 1). See J.R.A.S., 1914, p. 302.

पवित्र, a :trainer (or purifier) consisting of 2 blades of Kusa grass of equal length [See Eggeling's note on Satap 1 1 3 1, and Kātyayana Śrauta n 75 (p 127) Jha (p 269 of Prab Mīmāṃsā) says they are used for sprinkling water The *Vedic Index*—“The sieve used for purifying the Soma’ and “seems clearly to have been made of sheep's wool”], 429

“पशुकाम उक्त्यं गृहीयात् etc”, 384

“पशुगन्धस्य यज्ञकतो पद्म ऋत्विज. etc” (TS 2 3 6 3 etc), 491.

“पशुमालभेत” (TB 1 5 9 7),—608—9

“पश्वद्वं रशना चेत् etc,” 528

पश्वेकत्वन्याय, 443

पष्टौही (fem of पष्टयह),—a cow, 516 [Wrongly given as य in Sabara. In both edns of Madhava it is प्र (with पृ as variant in one) and defined thus—“यायता चयसां घर्षत्रयरुपेण पृष्ठे भारं चोहुं शक्तिर्भवति ताघदयस्का प्रष्टौही” See Vedic Index]

“प्रष्टौही दीपति” ‘he gambles with a cow (as stake)’,—516—17 (cf Apast, Sr XVIII 19 2)

पाञ्चदश्य, 369 (See “पञ्चदशसामिधेनी.”)

पाठक्रम, textual sequence,—537,540,546,586 Kātyayana Sr : 81

पाणिमात्रपुष्करा, (उपभृत) ‘a ladle with a bowl of the size of a hand’ (See Eggeling's note on 1 3 1 1) Printed text erroneously reads प्रा, 564

पात्नीयतग्रह (See Index to Jha), 187, 269

पायिकृतीय, relating to Agni (पथिकृत) 257

पारिप्लव, 122 [अश्यमेष्ये वाच स्तोमे च पारिप्लवं शंसन्ति Bhamati p-252]

पार्षुरद्दम N of a Saman, 491

पिकनेमसतनामरसादिशक्ता, 71 Samples of words in use among Mlechhas

पिङ्गल (and his first sutra) quoted — 16

पिण्डपिनृयज्ञ (Satap 11 4 2) — 389 829—7 766—7

पुत्रनि थ्रयसाय, 511—12

पुन श्रुति repetition 156 166 1/7

पुनराधेय, the re establishment of the Sacred fire (Satap 2 2 3 and note on 4 5 1 13) — 719

पुनरक्त, repetition tautology — 476 (ग्रथभयेन पुनरुक्त नेच्छन्ति, अर्थात् ग्रहणात् विभ्यत पुन पुनरभिर्धायम नं वहु मन्यन्ते)

“पुरस्तात्ौर्णमास्याश्चतुरहे दीक्षेत्रक्” (T S 7 4 8 2 wh reads चतुरहे पुरस्तात् etc) — 713

“पुरस्तातुपसदां सौम्येन प्रचरन्ति etc (T B 1 8 1 2),—518, 526 Apast Sr xxii 1 33

पुराकृतप, one of the division of the Brahmanas — a description of something done formerly by many people (Trans of Tantravart p 572) 127 703,755

‘पुरा वसानामुपाकर्तोर्दम्पती अश्नीयाताम्’, 696—7

‘पुरुषीर्पमुपदधा ति,’ 727

पुरुषार्थ, something wh tends to the advantage of the Sacrifice — 435—6 [क्रतव्ये भ क्रत्वर्थं पुरुषाय य स पुरुषार्थं]

पुराढाश (says the purvapak 10) is only applied to a cake made of consecrated flour —but this is disproved by examples from ordinary life Cf ‘पुरोडाशेन मे माता प्रह्लकं ददाति See प्रह्लक infra) 94

पुराढाश आग्नेय कर्तव्य,’ 336

पुरोडाशर्यालेन तुपानुपवपति 452 728 तुगा उपवपन्ति should be तुपान् (?)

“पुरोडाश पर्याग्निकरोति,” 225

‘पुरोडाशशक्लमै द्रव्यायवस्य पात्रं etc 479

पुरोनुघाषया, an introductory verse 408 [In Satap 2 2 2 1 Eggeling renders it The invitatory prayer The Vedic

Index defines it as "The technical term for the address to a god inviting him to partake of the offering it was followed by the *yājya*, wh accompanied the actual oblation ']

"पुरोहितं वृणीत," 731

पुष्कर, the bowl part of a ladle —564 [See Eggeling on 131 1, and Vedic Index] Apast Srauta xiv 24 12

पूतीक an authorized substitute for the soma plant [See Vedic Index] —383,659—60 669

पूर्णक, a man's name(?) (See Kunte's note on 3 2 30),—268,615

'पूर्वस्यां दिर्शं पता देवता etc ', 643

"पूर्वपरीभूतं भावमाटश्रातेनाचष्टे etc , ' 13

'पूर्वेनुरग्नं गृह्णाति etc ", 595

"पूर्वदुरमवास्यायां वेदिं ऋति " 553

"पृथुपाजयःयौ 'पार' " those two verses The first of which begins with the word पृथुपाज are Dhīyā? (Kunte See R N 3 27 5 6 and Apast Srauta 19 18 3) 570

"पृथदाज्येनानुयायान्यज्ञति ' (T S 6 3 11 6) 457,560,563,568

[In Satap 2 5 2 41 Eggeling renders पृथदाज्य by "clotted butter " and in a note adds '(lit mottled butter) is clarified butter mixed with sown milk]

पृष्ठवामत् See धराजपृष्ठ

पृष्ठाकोट, 'twisting of the back — in turning from side to side to point out and explain diff things to a pupil Kumānla (p 416) explains it thus —

"धरणिगतानेकद्यग्रत्येकनिरक्षणे धुन धुन पृष्ठं कुटिली-
किगत इति तसाम न्येन पृष्ठास्तोटाभिधागम् " See Trans p 570] —125

पोत्रीया The Rik verses to be recited by the pota priest —407, 421 (T B 3 12 9 5) Cf Apast Sr viii 24 8 9

"पौराणीनेऽश्वसहस्रं दक्षिणा " 329

"पौर्णमासीमेष यजेत भ्रातृव्ययान् etc 648—9 655

पौष्टिष्ठेषण, an offering to pushan,—205,306—7

"प्रउगं शंसनि॒तं", The prauga Śastra is the name of second hymn at morning oblation (M V. See Eggeling's note Vol 2 p 324), 118

प्रकरण 'context' (Jhā),—140,282,284

"प्रकृतिप्रत्ययौ प्रत्ययार्थं सह वूत् " (Mahabhaṣya 3 1.67, vārt 2),—320

प्रचरणी, a ladle,—551

"प्रचर्षणिभ्य " (R V 1 109 6),—256 283, (in both instances Śabara has प्रच)

"प्रजाकामं चतुहोऽत्रा याजयेत् etc ", 702

"प्रजाकामो यजेत्," 640

"प्रजापर्ति वै प्रजा सृजमानं etc ", 756

"प्रजापतिरात्मनो वपासुदग्विदत्" (T S 2 1 1 4),—39

"प्रजापतिवैरुद्धायाश्वमनयत्,"—(T S 2 3 12 1),—332.

"प्रजापतिर्वा अग्निष्टोम etc ", 583

"प्रजापतिर्वा इदमेक आसन्ति etc ", 278 (T S 2 1 1 4)

प्रजापतिव्रत (= ग्रह्यचारिव्रत ?)—See Manu iv 37 and Brahma Sutra bhāṣya 1 1 4 (p 76),—328,438,41,645

"प्रजासुत्पादयेत्", 651

प्रणाद्या, 'mediately,' 'indirectly' (in opp to साक्षात्),—391

प्रणीताः (आप , certain Sacrificial vessels filled with consecrated water. [See Eggeling's note on i 1 1 20 and xi 9 3 8] —477

"प्रणीताभिर्द्वीपि संयौति," 477 [In his Index to Apast' Srauta, Garbe renders प्रणीता 'holy water']

"प्रणोदेवी सरस्वती" (T S 1 8 22 1), 545

"प्रतितिष्ठान्ति ह वा एते य पता उपपन्ति." 501

प्रतिनिधि, a substitute,—वीवारा for ब्रोहि, 381,382 (The former inferior to the latter) 659 पूर्तीक for सोम,—393,649, 663 666

प्रतिपञ्चिकम् The final disposing of all the materials used at a Sacrifice thus, the black antelope's horn is thrown into

the चात्याल whilst remnants of cake etc are eaten and drunk (See Jhā's *Prabhākara* A'7 pp 172,199,218),—253,474—5,477,698

प्रतिपद्, a Rik to be recited at the beginning of a Stotra (Mādhaba 4)

[In Āpast Śrauta ii 9 2 The word प्रतिपदि is explained by "प्रथमायामृच्यारंभे धा" in the com! In the Index Garbe renders it introductory verse],—297.

प्रतिप्रधानमाधर्चन्ते गुणा, 287 See a passage on 16 (See Maxims, Part iii)

प्रतिप्रसव, a counter order, an exception, 750

"प्रतिप्रस्थात सवसीयान्विषपस्वेति प्रेष्यति"

प्रतिसमानी There are 2 examples of this verb (perhaps from Śrauta Sutra) on p 542 The abridged St Petersburg alone shows नी with the 3 upasargas, and gives Āpast Śrauta 7 14 8 (प्रतिसमानाय) as an example

प्रतिहोम, a supplementary oblation to be offered when certain ceremonies have been omitted during a Jyotiṣṭoma (See Mādhaba and Kunte on 6 5 40) 717—8

प्रतीक (?), 155—6

प्रत्यक्ष, defined,—6

प्रत्यक्षस्तु क्लेशो याग, 642

प्रत्यगात्मन्, 'The individual himself —395 See J R A S 1914, p 304

प्रत्याम्ना ('प्रत्यान् ते' in Sutra 6 4 30), 'To take the place of,' to be substituted for something else The noun प्रत्याम्नाद्य is used in explaining it, wh according to the Vachaspatyam, means 'a substitute' So, too प्रत्याम्नान यet, in his Index to the Āpast Śrauta Sutras, Garbe renders both of them 'Corollary' !,—691

प्रत्याम्नाय, 692 (See above)

"प्रत्येकं याऽप्यपरिसमानि ", 223

- (Panbhāṣa See Mahābhāṣya, Vol I, p 57 etc)
"प्रदोषमग्निहोत्रं हांतवां व्युष्ट यां प्रात.", 648—9
"प्रपिष्ठानां कर्तव्या" (i.e the रक्षन्' is to be made of crushed दर्भ),—378
प्रभुत्वयोग, 'the relation of lordship or ownership' (with reference to the meaning of सर्वस्व in connection with विश्वजित्), 742—3
प्रमगन्दो राजा (Rv iii 53 14) The king of the Kikatas See Vedic Index, 58
प्रमत्तगीत, 'sung by (or song of) a mad man or drunkard' (See same in Mahābhāṣya vol i, p 3),—160 231
प्रयत्नेनान्विच्छङ्गतो न चंद्रेषमवगच्छेमहि etc 8 (Quoted in Nyayamanjri, p 173)
"प्रयाजेषेण हृषीष्यभिघारयति" 457
प्रयाजः: 'fore offerings'—"oblations of clarified butter introductory to the chief Sacrifice" (note to Satap 1.3 2 8)
 There are 5 of them corresponding with the 5 seasons (1 5 3 1),—563
"प्रयाजे प्रयाजे शृण्णल ज्ञुहोति " 367,531 (T. S 2.3.2.3. and Apast Srauta xix 21 10).
प्रयोगकालाद्विरेतद्वां सदनुपकारकं भवति, 438
प्रयोगप्राशुभावात् 'on all of rapidity of utterance (?)',—537.
प्रवर The call to Agni or to a priest to assist at a Sacrifice (See Satap 1.4 2 1, and 1.5 1 1-Also Kunte on Sutra 3.5 4 4 and Vedic Index),—128,360—1.
प्रवर्ग्य, the offering of heated milk as introductory to a Soma Sacrifice, 304 (See Eggeling on 3 4 4 1).
प्रवीण; a sequence determined by the procedure, or order of commencement (of a series of acts, to be followed throughout),—537,542,550,587.
प्रसहाकारिन्, 101,682
प्रस्तरप्रदृशणन्याय, 252,698—9. (See Maxims iii)
'प्रस्तोता प्रस्तौति etc.', 397.

“प्रहृत्य परिधीन् जुहोति हारियाजतम्” (cf Apist Srauta VIII 17 1), 509

प्रहेलकं, a sweetmeat (a Purodas'a as such),—94

प्राक्तमिक 'one who undertakes much without finishing anything' (Said to occur in com on Gout Dharma Sastra 9 73) प्राक्तमिकोऽयं कापुरुष 504.

“प्राचीनवशं करोति” (T S 6 1 1 1) 317.

“प्राचीं देवा अभज्ञत” (Ditts),—316

“प्राचीमाहरति etc (cf T B 3 2 1 3) 472 (प्राची is the name of a branch—not of a region)

“प्राणभृत उपदधाति” [प्राणभृतः is the name of certain bricks forming one of the layers of the Sacrificial altar Satap VIII 1 17],—105

“प्राणापानवेवा मन्त्रसं” (T S 2 5 2 4) 322

“प्रात् प्रातरनृतं ते वदन्ति etc” 198 (Ait Br v 31, vol 3, p 192)

प्रातरनृवाक्, ‘morning hymn’ [“the Prataranuvāka, or morning prayer has to be recited by the Hotṛi in the latter part of the night before any sound (of birds etc) is to be heard. It may begin immediately after midnight and conclude as soon as day light appears’ Eggeling's note on Satap 3 9 3 10 For other references See Vedic Index] —407,409,551

प्रातर्दौह, 377

“प्रायणीयेषि, ‘opening Sacrifice’,—345 (Satap 3 2 3, and See Eggeling's long note on pīra 6 of same)

प्रायदर्शन (Sutra 2 3 16 “विशये प्रायदर्शनात् is rendered by Kunte—“In case of doubt the generality of texts (ought to determine the sense), and by Jhā—“In a doubtful case, the correct conclusion is arrived at by a perception of similarity”,—184

प्रायिक 'usual,—125,126,127

प्राये (in Sutra 22.12 'प्रायेदर्शनाच्च' is rendered thus by Jhā— "Also because the Sacrifice in question is mentioned in Vedic texts as if it were a primary Sacrifice Kunte's transn. of the Sutra is—" "(It is in original statement) because something is frequently described (as principal and important),—146

प्रावर्तिकक्रमःयाय (See प्रवृत्ति), 542

प्राप्तिशब्द The portion of the Havis eaten by the Brāhmaṇa at a Sacrifice [In a note on 17.4.10 Eggeling says— 'According to Katy. iii 4.7 the *pratitṛta*, or Brāhmaṇa's portion, is to be of the size of a barley or pippala berry"], 241,676

प्रासनः The throwing of the black deer's horn into the pit (चात्याल) as in Sat 4.4.5.2 and T. S 6.1.3.8,—478—9.

प्रीति, secular pleasure, the desire of gain, is said to be the motive for man's action,—435,438

प्रीतिहिं स्वर्गं स्वर्गेष्व प्रीतिं प्रार्थयते,—500

"प्रैतु होतुश्चमस etc",—349, 350,356 (Satap 4.2.1.29 and Apast Sr. xii 23.13)

प्रैष, 'an order',—408,423,772 ["A liturgical term meaning 'direction' or 'invitation', repeatedly found in later Samhitās and Brahmanas' *Vedic Index*]

प्रैषपर्यकारिन् The performer of the sense of a Sacrificial direction,—424

प्रोक्षणी (in Sutra 14.11), to be taken in its literal (योगिक) sense,—95

"प्रोक्षणीरासादय. etc",—95,423,772 (Apast Sravata 2.3.11),

फलचमस, a cup containing crushed figs of the Juncos Indica with Sour milk, as a Substitute for Soma juice (See com² on Apast. Sravata xii 24.5), 362, Said to be inferior to Soma, 351.

- फलदर्शनात्कानि फलवन्ति, 496
- फलवत्सन्निधेस्तु आधारादीन्यारादुपकारकाणि, 141
- फलवत्सन्निधावफलं तदङ्गं, 525, 532 (*See Mātrīsu* ii)
- वर्हिरदेवसदनं जातिवाचिता, 94 Mātrī Sanhitā 112 (Bloomfield)
- “वर्हिरादिशब्दानां दामि” 1—243, 660
- वर्हन्यार्थ, 243
- ‘वर्हिपा यूपावटमवस्तृणाति’ 428
- “वर्हिपा यै पौर्णमासे व्रतमुपयन्ति,” 694, 696
- ‘वर्हिषि हर्वीषि आसादयति’ 387
- वर्हिस is the ordinary equivalent of तृण and *not* restricted to consecrated grass,—94
- वल्वज, a kind of coarse grass,—116
- वहिरङ्गत्य, 548
- वहिवेदि, outside the sacrificial ground or altar, 392
- वहिपवमान (स्तोत्र),—551 [“The first stotra at each pressing is called *pavamana* (purifying, i.e. during the chanting of which the soma becomes clarified) viz the *Bahupavamana* at the morning, the *Madhyandina* pavamāna at the mid day, and the *Arbhava* (or *tritiya*) pavamāna at the evening pressing. The other Stotras are called *Dhurjya*, to be harnessed, belonging to or forming a team” Eggeling's note on iv 2 5 7]
- वहुकृत्योऽपि पश्य वेदितव्यं भवति, 476 (an illustration to show that repetition is sometimes necessary, and is not then a fault)
- वहुपु राजप्रतिमेपु उपविष्टेपु यस्य श्वेतं छत्रं वालग्यजनं च स
राजेत्यवगम्यते, 282
- वहृचग्राहण, 194 653 *Apast Sraut* xiii 4 22
- “याणवन्तः परिधय”, enclosing logs made of बाण wood (?)
[In a letter dated 12 Aug 1912, Jhā says that बाण is

some kind of wood, but that it is impossible to say what that wood is],—118. See परिधि.

पाद्रायण, mentioned in Sutra,—7,565,608.

पादरि mentioned in Sutra,—209,622.

वार्हद्विर, N. of a Sāman,—491 [named after वृहद्विरि a yati mentioned in the Pañcavimśa Brāhmaṇa *Vedic Index*]

"वार्हद्विरं वास्तुणस्य ब्रह्मसाम कुर्यात्", 491,623,733,735.

"वृहद्रथन्तरं पृष्ठं भवति",—729.

वृहस्पति सव,—507,514 [It is performed by a Brāhmaṇa with a view to obtaining the office of Purohita (royal chaplain, or family priest). Āśvalāyana places it on a level with the Rajasuya. Eggeling's note on Satap. v.2.1.19].

"वैलवो यूपो ग्रह्यवर्चसकामेन कर्तव्य." (cf. T. S. 2.1.8.1),—370
(See Apast. Dharma Sūtra 1.9.26.8, and Gaut. Dharma xxiii. 17. Also Sankara's Bhāṣya 3.4.41 and Thibaut).

"ग्रहचार्यवकीर्णि निर्वृतं गर्दभमालभेत" (sh: sacrifice an ass to Nirvṛti), 769.

ग्राहण, as distinct from mantra, defined,—(Apast. Srauta xxiv. 1.31.32), 127.

"ग्राहणं शृणीते etc",—398.

"ग्राहणं परिक्षीणीयत् etc.",—347 (T. B. 1.8.6.2)

मत्ति, figurative language,—433.

"भक्षेहि माऽविश दीर्घायुत्वाय etc," 262 (T. S. 3.2.5.1).

भयता शाकमप्यादर्तब्यमिति काप्ताद्वये शाकादरणमुपाधिः, 501.
भघन्ति घक्तारः 'they say', or 'so people say', 94,95. Here

and on p. 484, it is घक्तारो भघन्ति. See J.R.A.S. 1914, pp: 306,734,208,484. [See Kielhorn's paper in J.R.A.S. for 1898, pp. 19,20, on this expression in Mahābhāṣya, vol. i, pp. 5 and 250, vol. ii, pp. 272,417, which he regards as an adaptation of the Pali *vattare hanti* of the Jātaka.]

"भसदा पद्मीः संयाजयन्ति etc",—612 (भसद् = pudenda).

"भसमा इष्टकाः न्युज्यात्", 380.

भास्त्, in a secondary sense, figurative, 434

"भार्या दासद्वय पुत्रश्च निर्वत्ताः सर्वं एव ते", 611

भाष्यशब्दाः, words expressive of भाषना and producing *apurva*,—109, 111, 113, 124

भिष्मं कपालमप्सु प्रवहन्ति", 680

"मिष्टे ज्ञुहोति स्फङ्ग ज्ञुहोति" [See Satap. XII 4 1 6 7 as to the *breaking* of a vessel or *spilling* of milk Also Āśvalāyana Śrauta 3 11 6—11], 650, 656, 677, 680, 719 See J R A S, 1914, p 301

भिषज्, **भिषक्ति** [In the pres. Indic it is found in R. V. VIII 79 2 viz भिषक्ति विश्वं यनुरम् 'all that is sick he heals (or, according to Griffith, he medicines)'] Under Jaimini's Sutra 2 2 10, Sabara employs it in the sense of 'to remedy' He says आग्नेयाग्नीषोमीयया निरन्तरं क्रिय-माणयोर्जामितादोप उक्त , तं भिषजितुमुषोण्याजमन्तरा यजति इति पिहितम्। That is in order to *remedy* the deficit that would be brought about by bringing those 2 offerings together, the upāmsuyāja is brought in between them He then says—कथं तेन भिषजिष्यते—"how will it be remedied by that means ? We thus have the verb in the Infinitive mood, active voice, and in the future Indicative, passive voice—145

भुक्तिभूतकदानादि, 717

भूर्तं भव्यायोपदिश्यते,—viz 2 1 4 , 3 4 40 , 4 1 18 , 4 , 2 10 , 111 337, 347, 475, 600 [See 'Maxims III']

"भूतेष्का उपदधाति" (T S 5 6 3 1), 380, 573 575

भृगुगुनकवीसिष्टाः, 736

भृति, food, nourishment ('भृतिय-वीत' वद् to procure), 713

भोजनकालो चर्तते स्थालानि संमृत्यन्ताम् (where स्थालानि represents and includes all vessels in use when dining), 230

भ्रष्टे चावस्तरेऽनुष्ठायमानो यजमानस्य विगुणः स्यात् etc, 361
[The प्रचर is here the subject] Cf Pitāmīyah 1 2 64 (42)

भ्रूणहन्, 608

मत्वर्थलक्षणा, 'possessive indication , [by which term is understood the denoting a thing by some thing else connected with it as a quality etc , as when the word soma is made to denote a Sacrifice in which soma is used Thibaut's transn of *Arthaśāṅg aha*] —86

मध्यक (?) Is it =**मध्यमक** common (as property),—634—5

"**मध्यत कारिणां** etc [Apast Śrauta xii 23 4 The com—explains this term by "दोतृष्महोद्रातुर्यजमानसदस्यानाम् ", 267.

"**मध्यनिदेऽपररात्रे वा ब्रत ब्रतयति**," 773

"**मध्यमानामप्यं दात्र पुरोडाशा** etc (T S 2 5 5 2, which reads ये मध्यमा. स्युस्तानग्नये etc),—705

"**मध्या पूर्वार्द्धाद्येदयम्**" [i e a piece of the purodasa is to be cut from the middle and end as द्यवदात] ,674

मनोतामन्त्र ["त्वं ह्यमे प्रथमो मनोता" Rv vi 111 T B 3 6 10 1],—562.

मन्त्र is merely अभिधानचाची and not विधायक,—Sutra 2 1 3 but some mantras are अनभिधायक, e g घसन्ताय कपिंजलानालभते,—2 1 32 (p 128)

म-द्राभिभूति etc' (T S 3 2 5 1), 264 Rv x 128 1 "Let me win glory Agni in our battles (Griffith)

"**ममाद्य वर्चो विहवेप्पस्तु**",—425 (T S 4 7 14 1 See विहवा)

"**मलयद्वाससा** [खिया] न संगदेत् etc' (T S 2 5 1 5), 325

मलहा, having a dew lap (a cow etc), 516 (See Apast Śrauta xviii 21 13)

"**मस्तु पितृणां** etc [T S 6 1 1 4 मस्तु is sour cream] —318

"**मस्तु शुद्रस्य**", 624

महाभाष्य, quoted 13 492

महायज्ञा; there are 4 viz Agnihotra, New and Full moon, Jyotiṣṭoma, and Pūṇḍapitṛī, 526

महायाक्ष्य, contrasted with अवा-तरचाक्ष्य, 689

मानसुवावद्वरणं क्रमोऽभिपव are said to be the सोमधर्मा at a Jyotiṣtoma —381

मात्रनवर्णिक, contained in the words of a Vedic hymn,—90

Apast ६, vii 173 reads “यत्पशुर्मायुमहृतेति संशाते संशातहोमं जुहोति,” but the com says that the होम was offered *only* because of the killing and not because of the मायुकरण ! See संशात होम See J R A S, 1914 pp 305, 732 मायु, a cry of pain (दु यदेतुकशब्द) made by an animal when being killed for a sacrifice and which necessitates the संचिप्तहोम (Sayan on T S 3 1 4 3), 772

“मासमग्निहोत्रं जुहोति etc 526, 196 [See Taṇḍya Br ११ ४ १ and Thibaut's note on Vedanta Sūtra 3 3 40]

माहाजानिक, 15

“मादे-द्रस्य स्तोत्रं प्रथमिष्ठिते,’ 566

“मिषुन द्यै दधि च शृतं च etc , 450

“मिषोऽसंवन्धन्याय, 236 [‘the axiom of mutual non connection (Kunte)]

मिथ्याशान, defined, 8

मुख्य (with गौण), defined —243—6

मुखे हि शद्मुपलभामहे भूमावर्थम् 13 (Quoted in Nyaya mañjari, pp 155, 241)

मुख्यक्रम, the sequence of the Principal in relation to Subsidaries —537, 545, 587

“मुख्यगौणयोर्मुख्ये कार्यसंप्रत्यय.” (Mahābhāṣya 1 1, 5 and 6 3 46 etc) 246, 288, 711

“मुश्यव्यन्वाह” (the man holding the peske next recites) 479

“मुख्यरामवन्ति सेद्वियराय,” 446 (T B 1 8 2 2)

“मुष्टिना पिधाय etc, 375

“मुष्टीकरोति घाचं यच्छ्रुतिं दीक्षितमावेदयति’ (cf T S 5 2 1 7 1—239

“मूलत. घास्यो शाश्वां परिवास्योपघेयं करोति” 473

मूर्पिकासूक्त, 122 [used at a sacrifice called पश्वकादेति नी
Kunte. See Jhā]

मृगतृष्णावत्, 432, 439, 531. (*Mahābhāṣya* iv. 1.3.)

"मेखलया दीक्षुयति," 578, 614. (T. S. 6.1. 5).

"मेघश्च यज्ञो यज्ञश्च त्यागः," 415.

मेध्यतम्, (conditions under which a man is) *most fit to sacrifice*,—
415.

"मैत्रावरुणं पयसा श्रीणाति," 379—80, 698 (T. S. 6.4.2),

"मैत्रावरुणाय दण्डं प्रयच्छति", 478 (T. S. 6.1.4.8.2).

मोदकशक्ति, 454.

म्लेच्छाः: (See शिष्टाः)

"यः पशुकामः स्याऽमोऽमावास्यायामिष्ठा , " 701, 703.

"यः प्रथमः शक्तिः परापतेत्स स्वरुपार्थः," 468 (cf. Satap. 3.6.
4.11). See Āpast. Strauta xiv. 23.1.

"यः सत्राय आगुरते," 693.

"यः सोमेन यज्यमाणोऽग्नीतादधीत etc., " 588, 592.

"यः सोमेनायज्यमाणोऽग्निमादधीत etc., " 589.

"यः सोमेन यजेत सोऽग्निमादधीत," 589.

"य इष्ट्या पशुना यज्यमाणः etc., 595.

"य इष्टा पशुना सोमेन वा यजेत etc., " 513.

"य पतामिष्टकामुपदध्यात्स त्रीन्वरान्दध्यात्" (T. S. 5.2.8.2, wh:
reads योऽविद्वानिष्टकाः etc),—412.

"य पतानिष्ठा अथायेन यजेत etc., " 584.

"य एवं विद्वांसः सत्रमासते etc, 732, 737.

"य एवं विद्वानग्निमाचते,"—280, 615, 623, 626.

"य एवं विद्वानग्निं चिनुते" (T. S. 5.5.2.1),—189, 521—2,
566, 574.

"य एव कश्चन स्तोमभागमधीयीत स एव ग्रह्णा भवेत्," 736.

य एव लौकिकाः शब्दास्त पव वैदिकास्त एवैयामर्थाः, 79.

य एव भूतस्योत्सर्गे दोपः स एवाश्रुतपरिकल्पनायाम, 340.

"यथातुर्जुञ्जर्हा गृह्णाति भ्रतुश्चस्तदगृह्णाति" (Satap. 1.3.2.8),—
462.

यज्ञति (= याग), defined,—483

"**यज्ञमानः प्रस्तरः**", 'the grass-bedding is the master of the sacrifice' (Transn. of Tantravart., p. 441),—100.

"**यज्ञमानचमतः सोममय एकेषां** etc.," 735

"**यज्ञमान पञ्चमा इदां भक्षयन्ति**," 676

"**यज्ञमानस्य याज्या सोऽभिप्रेष्यति होतरेत्यजेति** etc,"—360.

"**यज्ञमानो यूपः**," 103.

यज्ञस् is the name given to mantras which are *not* in metrical feet (like the ऋक्), or set music (like the सामन्),—129.

"**यज्ञगत्या परिदध्यात्** etc.", 571.

यज्ञपात्राणि, the sacrificial vessels used by an आहिताश्चि must be burnt with his body when he dies (See *Aśval. Grīhya Sutra* 4.2.1),—442,739.

यज्ञफलु, a sacrificial ceremony or rite,—(See a good example in Satap. x. 4 3.4, also 1 x. 3.3 1), 402, 583—5, 481.

"**यज्ञघेशसाय धा इदं कर्म**," 529.

"**यज्ञायर्थणां वै काम्या इष्टयः** etc.", 430.

"**यज्ञायज्ञीयं गायति**",—280 (The N. of a Sāman).

यज्ञायुधानि, the ten sacrificial utensils (as per T. S. 1.6.8.3),—214,441.

यज्ञाधर (यज्ञप्रचारहेतु Madhava), 'having its sphere in the sacrifice' (MW), 237.

"**यज्ञेन यज्ञमयजन्त देवाः**" (Rv. 1.164.50, A. vii 5.1),—51, 127
(as an example of the पुराकल्प type of Brāhmaṇa).

"**यज्ञो द्वि यज्ञस्य प्रायश्चित्तिः**," 680.

यत्कालं मर्दनं तत्कालं मर्दनसुखं, 506 (T. S. v. 6 8.1 with मिन्नुयात्).

"**यत्पद्मसम्मतां विनुयात्** etc.", 199,205.

"**यत्पद्मिदितं तदेवानां** etc.", 317 (T. B. 1.6 8 6).

"**यत्पद्मायुमकृत्** etc.", 772 (T. S. 3.1.4.3 where Sāyaṇa explains मायुं अकृत by "मारणवेलापां मायुं दुष्यदेतुकशद्-मकृत")

- "यपितृभ्य पूर्वेषुः करोति etc — 525 (T B 13102)
 यत्पुरुपस्य प्रयोजनं श्रीतिस्तदर्थं धनस्याज्ञनम्, 438
 "यत्पूर्णं तत्मनुष्ठाणां etc — 317 (T B 1684)
 यत्प्रयाजानुयाजा इत्यन्ते etc 487,530 (T S 2615) Apast
 Sr. vii 55
- "यत होतु प्रातरनुवाकमनुवृत्त उपश्ट्रगुयात्, 407,409
 "यत्रान्या ओपधयो म्लायन्ते etc 70
 यथाकृतं तथा साधु, 752
- "यथा चमसमन्यांश्चमसांश्चमसिनो भक्षयन्ति etc — 353,355
 "यथा वै मस्योऽविदितो जनमवधुन्ते," 374
 यद्घृतमभोजनं तद्, 104 (cf T S vi 641)
 "यदस्तवेदि मिनुयति etc, — 392
 "यदन्यांश्चमसानुनयन्ति etc, — 364
 "यदन्यांश्चमसाऽनुहृति etc' — 363
 "यदएवुग्भृति गृह्णाति प्रयाजानुयाजेभ्य." (T B 3355),—462
 "यदहृत्वैनं अद्वोपनमेतदहरादधीति (Satap 2139 with यज्ञ.
 for अद्वा), 592
- "यदाग्रेयाऽष्टाकपाल etc, — (T S 2633),—140,336,655,674.
 "यदाक्ते चक्षुरेव चातृव्यस्य वृंके" (T S 6115),—487.
 "यदा तद्वचि संतिष्ठेत," 680—2 (cf Apast xi 211)
 "यदातिष्यायां वर्द्धिस्तदुपसदां etc ' 485
 "यदाऽनयनं तदामेधार्ह", 415
- "यदा वै पुरुषेन किञ्चनान्तर्भवति . आथ मेधयतमः," 415
 "यदाहवनीये ज्ञुहृति" (T B 11105), 661, with ज्ञुहृति, 690,
 762, and 766
- "यदि कामयेत वर्यतपञ्जन्य," 417, 505 (cf T S vi 455)
 "यदि पशुरुपाकृतः पल्लायेत etc — 80
- "यदि पुरादीक्षाणा एषु etc ' 198, 204
 "यदि विभीयादभिमोदेष्यतीति etc, — 702—3
 "यदि रथन्तरसामा सोम एयात् etc' (Apastamba Sranta
 vii 14 1)

"यदि राजन्यं वैश्यं चा याजयेत् etc." 168 (*Aपाइt. Sr.* xii. 24.-5),
350, 362, 381.

"यदि चर्वेत्ताथत्येव जुहुयादिन वर्षेत् श्वोभूते जुहुयात्,"—503
(T. S. 2.4. 10. 1).

यदि सत्राय दीक्षिता अथ 'साम्युक्तिप्रेरन्' (*Sāṅkhāyana Śrauta*
xiii. 13.1 in singular), 711.

"यदि सोमं न विन्देत् पूतिका न मिष्पुण्यात्" (cf *Aपाइt. Sr.* xiv. 24.
12), 383, 659, 669.

"यदि सोममपहरेयुरेकां गां दक्षिणां दद्यात्" (*Satap. iv. 5.10*
1.6.),—443.

यदुत्साहं जनयत्यवै गुणाय, 418.

"यदुपभृति गृहाति अनुयाजेभ्यस्तद् गृहाति" (*Satp. 1.3.2.9*), 462.

"यदेवादः पौर्णमासं हविः etc., 590, 593, 596.

"यदग्निष्टोमो जुद्वोति, यत्युक्त्यः परिधिमनक्ति etc."—383, 386.

"यद्यज्ञपा जुहुयात् etc." 577 (T. B. 1.1.6 9).

"यद्यन्यस्य वृक्षस्य स्वरुपं कुर्यात् etc." (cf *Aपाइt. Sr.* vii. 3.
5)—467.

यद्यस्य कारणभूतं ददृशं सिद्धे etc., 159.

यद्यस्योपकरोति तत्त्वस्य शेषभूतम्, 387.

"यदेकं कपालं नश्येदेको मासः संवत्सरस्य अपेतः स्यात् etc.—511
(T. S. 2.6.3.6).

यदेनारभ्यते तत्तदङ्गम्, 574.

"यद्द्विं हविर्यानं प्राचीप्रवर्तयेयुः etc," (T. S. 3.1.3.1),—451.

यद्यद्वार घेतसशृद्धाः, 70

यचाग्, rice—gruel,—307.

"यद्याग्नू सद्गन्धस्य," 493, 623 (T. S. 6.2.5.2).

"यश्चोभयोः पल्योदीपां न तमेकश्चोद्यो भवति" (also in viii. 3.14,
taken from *Mahābhāṣya* vi. 1.9),—735.

"यस्य खादिरः सुवो भवति etc," (T. S. 3.5 7.1),—366, 487, 501.

"यस्य गृहान्दहति etc," 437 (T. S. 2.2.2.5).

* if they should rise up without completing it—i. e. if they should fail to carry it to completion.

यस्य च तुष्टे कारणं etc,'—8 (Quoted in *Njayamāñjari*, p 165 यथ च etc)

"यस्य नवातेशतं स्तोत्रियाः" Ait B m 41), 582

"यस्य पर्णमयी ज्ञुहूर्मेवति etc, 366,487 (T S 3 5 7 1 2)

"यस्य मजाता विषयायु " etc 256

"यस्य ग्रत्येऽहनि etc See "ग्र-येऽहनि "

"यस्य सर्वाणि द्वार्यापि नश्येयुर्दुष्येयुर्वा etc, 674

"यस्य हृषिनिरूपं etc, —706—7 (T S 2 5 5 1)

"यस्य हिरण्य नश्येत् etc, 437 (T S 2 3 2 5)

"यस्याविने शास्यमाने सूर्यो नोदियात्",122

"यस्यैवंरूपः स्व इव etc 368 (T S 3 5 7 3)

"यस्याभयं हृषिरात्माच्छुत् etc , ' (T B 3 7 1 8),—683, 690

"यस्योभावनुगतावग्नी अभिनिम्लोचत् etc ' (अनुगतौ=नष्टौ), 689

"यां वै कांचन ऋत्विज आधिपमारासते यजमानस्यैव सा," 426

"या वै कांचिद्धृष्ट्युध्य यजमानश्च देवतामन्तरित etc,' (T S 3 5 9 1)

"यां वै कांचिद् ग्राहणवतोमिष्टकामभिजानीयात्," 575

यागोऽपूर्वस्य दाता, 389

याच्चाक्षयणम् 'begging and buying , 771 2

याज्या, The *yajyās* (offering prayers) are the prayers which the Hotri pronounces when the offerings are poured into the fire At the chief oblations the offering prayer is preceded by an *anuvakya* or *puro nuvakyā* (invitational prayer) by which the gods are invited to come to the offering, and which ends with *om'* (Eggeling's note, vol 1, p 135),—118—9,256,360

याज्यापनय, 360

"याज्याया अधि वपद्वकरोति etc,' 360—1

यां जना प्रतिनन्दान्ते रात्रौ etc,715

- या ते अग्नेऽयःया तनुर्विष्टा etc " 134 [V S 1. 8, Satap 3 4 4.
 30, "what most excellent iron clad body is thine, O Agni
 etc' (Eggeling)]
- यादशोऽस्य वेशस्तादयो नटानाम्, 315
 "या पत्या क्रीता सतो अथा यैश्चराति", 610
 'यावज्जीवमग्निहोनं जुहोति", 194 648,651,653,716
 यावज्जीविक (Sutra 2 4 1), 'lifelong,—194
 "यावतोऽश्वन्प्रतिगृहीयात् etc , 331 (T S 2 3 2 1)
 यावद्वचनं वाचनिकं भवत्येव 'it expresses just what is stated
 (and nothing more)', 361, 572, 590, 593
 यावांश थ्रुतस्योऽसर्गं दोपस्तावानेवा श्रुतक्लृप्तनायाम्, 491
 युगधरत्र, the strap of a yoke,—776
 "युवं हि स्य स्वर्धती" —297 8, 636 640 (R V XI 19 2)
 युवा सुवासा." (R V III 8, 4),—422, 528
 यूपकर्मन्याय, 551
 'यूपस्य स्वर्दं करोति", 466 7, 528
 "ये ऋत्विजस्ते यजमानाः", 537
 "येन कर्मणा *इत्सेत् etc ' (T S 3 4 6 2), 328
 येन च क्रिया प्रणाड्यापि सिध्यति स तस्या क्रियाया कर्ता, 333
 "ये पुरोडाशिनस्ते उपविशन्ति etc," 199
 "ये मध्यमा ये स्यविष्टा etc , ' 710 (T S 2 5 5 2) See also
 under 'मध्यमाना etc ''
- ये मामधुक्तन्त etc (an example of a mantra consisting of a
 complaint—परिदेवन),—126
 'ये यजमानास्ते ऋत्विज ", 733—4 (See ये ऋत्विज etc)
 'योक्तेणपद्मो सम्भ्रहति etc, ' 614 (T S 6 1 3 5)
 योगसिद्धि, 'Simultaneous accomplishment (M W), 506—7
 योगसिद्धिन्याय, 505
 "येऽद्वृभ्यं गृहीत्वा सोमाय यजते etc " (T S 3 3 4 2),—574
 'यो दीक्षितानां प्रमीयेत etc ', 665

- “यो दीक्षितो यदग्नीपोमीयं पशुमालभते”, 373 378,392,408,428
 443,466,528 667 773 (T S 6 1 11 6)
- यो देवदत्तस्य गौ स विष्णुमित्रस्य वर्तव्य इति देवदत्तादाच्छिद्य
 विष्णुमित्राय दीयते, 485
- “यो वा अध्वर्यो स्व वेद स्ववानेव भवति (He who knows the
 truth of the Adhvaryu priest indeed becomes wealthy —
 Kunte) (T S 3 1 2 3) 409 410
- ‘यो विद्वन् स नैऋत etc —317 (T S 2 6 3 4)
- “यो वै प्रिवृद्धं यज्ञरुपापत्त्वने etc 583—८
- “यो वै मास संवत्सर etc —739
- “यो वै संवत्सरमुत्थमभृत्वाग्नि चिनुते etc (T S 5 5 1 6),
 see उरय,—521
- “यो उमान्द्वेष्टि यं च वर्य द्विष्ठ, *” 772
- यो हि वहन्यागान्कल व्यति ब्रह्म-य-यसावेकम्, 154
- यो हि हिसितुमिच्छेत्स्यावसुपाय., 5
- “यो होता सोऽध्वर्युः, 422
- यांगिक, etymological or literal (meaning),—87,95
- रथकारन्याय, 630
- रथन्तरसामन् (adj) ‘having the R as its Sami,—168
- ‘रसायनं रायुर्दीर्घं प्राप्त्यन्ति , 736
- राजन्, King (*Sama*) —711—12
- राजनि जय वर्तमानं सैनिका अस्माकमिति व्यपदिशन्ति —‘ Soldiers
 speak of a victory achieved for the king as our victory,’
 428
- राजन्याग्निवध्यवशिष्ठवैन्यगुनका (Cf A V n 29 3 4),—
 726
- राजपुरपो राजानमाथितो राजकर्म करोनि 161
- राजसूय (Satap V 2 3),—516
- “राजसूयेन स्वाराज्यकामो यजेत् , 516
- रात्रिसत्रन्याय, 501

रायोचाजीय, N of १ Sāmīn,—491

राष्ट्रप्रतिपादनीयेषि, 507.

रुक्मप्रतिमोचन (T S 51 10 3), 566—7.

रुक्त, 'dry'—458—9 (See सूख्य)

रेवत्य, the 3 verses R V 1 30 13—15, the first of which begins with रेवतीर्नं सधमाद, whence the tune as adapted to this Triplet is usually called रेवत (Eggeling, vol iii, p xxi),—162

लक्षणा श्वदष्टकलपनाया ज्यायसी, 273

लाकुकायन, N of an ācārya,—759

लिङ्ग, "Power residing in words (the power words possess to denote or point out some thing) is called *linga*" (Thibaut's transn of *Artha Sangraha*, p 12) "*Linga*, sign, or 'the sense of the words' as leading to an inference" (Cowell's transn *Sandhya Sutra*, p 23, footnote),—256, 284, 285

"लोकं पृण etc" (T S 42 4 4),—575.

लोकं पृणा (इष्टका), N of a brick laid in building the altar, with the mantra लोकं पृणा (as above),—575

"लोहितं निरस्यति etc",—453

"लोहितोप्णीपा लोहितवसनात्रद्विज प्रचरन्ति", 416 (*Apast Srauta* च 16 6)

लौकिकानि वचनान्युपपन्नार्थाभ्यनुपपन्नानि च वृश्यन्ते, etc (see *Mahābhāya*, vol i, p 38),—13 For वक्तारो भवन्ति see भवन्ति वक्तारो ।

"र्याज्ञिणीस्तपदधाति" (T S 5 7 3 1), 380, 573—5

"वज्रो वै यूप", 392

"वज्रो वै स्फ्य. etc" T. B 3 2 10 1), 424

"वत्सं चोपायसूजति etc",—420 (T S 1 6 9 3 4)

"वत्सज्ञानुं पगुमामस्य वेदं कुर्यात्", 436 *Katjayana Srauta* 1 66—68 Compare वत्संयुंपगुमामस्य etc of *Apast Srauta* 1 6 5 वत्सज्ञानु=‘in the form of a calf’s knees’)

"वत्समालभेत etc , (T S 2148),—184

"वत्सेन व्रतमुपयन्ति", 694

वध्यश्व, having castrated horse The *N* of an ācārya (A. V.

ii 29 34 , Āpast Šr xxiv 66 *Vedic Index*), 726

"वपया प्रातः सवने चरन्ति etc , 376, 428

वयो वचन (?), 777—8

वरकाः, a kind of rice, 662

"वरुणगृहीतं वा एतद्यज्ञस्य यद्योजम् etc ", 480

वरुण प्रधास, 118 one of the 3 seasonal sacrifices offered

in Asādha Some details connected with the अवभूय
(expiatory birth) are transferred to it from Agnistoma.
[See note at head of Satap ii 51, and also ii 52 Also
Sabara 7 3 12 Garbe (in Index to Apast Śrauta) calls it
"the Second Parvan of the Caturmāsyā Sacrifices"]

वरुणो वा एत गृहाति योऽश्वं प्रतिगृहाति" (T S 2312 1),—
329

"वरुणो वा एतमेष्टे प्रत्यगृहात्" 499

वचन्याय, 425

"वचोंदा अग्ने असि वचों मे देहि", 418 (T S 1554)

"वर्षासु रथकार आदवीत", 630

वशा, 'a barren cow'—but combined with अजा (as अजावशा)
in T S 3432 it apparently means a *barren goat*, 119,121

"वपद्कर्तुः प्रथमभक्त", 355,357

"वसन्तमृतनां प्रीणामि" (T S 1623), 540

"वसन्ताय कपिञ्जलानालभते," 443 (V S xxvii 20, and Satap
viii 5113, and note See too Sabara vi 138).

"वसन्ते ग्राहणमुपनयीत etc,"—625

"वसन्ते ग्राहणोऽग्नीनादधीत etc,"— (T B 1126),—175,370,
438,619,622,626 639

"वसन्ते वसन्ते इयोतिपा यजेत्", 298,651

वाक्य, 'syntactical connection—one of the six means of as-
certaining what is subsidiary to what (Jha),—264-5

वाक्यमेद, 'Split of the Sentence,'—133 [See Note on p 177 of vol I, of Thibaut's Transl of Vedāntabhbāṣya]

"वाऽग्नै देवोऽयोऽपाकामद्यज्ञायातिष्ठमाना" (T S 6 1 4 1),—478

"वाग्नै हविष्कृत्" (Satap 1 1 4 11 and note), 250

वाजपेय, "N of one of the 7 forms of Soma Sacrifice (offered by kings or Brāhmaṇas aspiring to the highest position, and preceding the Rājasuya and Brihaspati Sava)". *MIV*. It is dealt with in Satap v 1 1 etc See, too, Eggeling's preface to vol III, pp xi and xxiii For this sacrifice नीचार is prescribed instead of ब्रीहि [Jai ix 2 40],—91,153,410, 416,419,456,507,772 [See *Vedic Index*]

"वाजपेयेन स्वारात्यक्षमो यजेत," 456

"वाजपेयेनेष्टा बृहस्पतिसवेन यजेत," 507,514

"वाजस्य मा प्रसवेन etc," 419 (T S 1 1 13 1)

वाजिन 'whey,' from which the curds (*आमिक्ता*) have been separated,—157,448,449,450 [See *Vedic Index*]

वाजिनन्याय, 449

"वाजिभ्यो वाजिनम्" ['The whey (vājina) is offered to the (divine) coursers, i e the regions or quarters' (Eggeling's note on ix 5 1 57 See too, 2 4 4 22, and *Vedic Index*],—157,449

II—STUDIES IN HINDU LAW.

BY GANGA NATH JHA

Chapter III

Judicial Procedure

In this Chapter we shall reproduce the words of Nārada, whose work among the *Sāṃhitā* contains the fullest and most comprehensive description of the subject, and as such may be regarded as the oldest complete account. Nārada's *Sāṃhitā* has been translated by Jolly, but from a minor version of the text (as explained by himself in his edition of Nārada's Text, Bib. Indica). But for our present purposes, as affording a glimpse of the subject as dealt with by an old *sāṃhitā* writer, this minor version is sufficient. We shall however, supplement it with explanations from some of the older *Dīgests*, and also with certain verses which are quoted by these as Nārada's. The most important among these verses are those dealing with the procedure to be adopted regarding the filing of the Plaintiff, the Answer and so forth. In the next Chapter an attempt shall be made to codify the Procedure as deduced from the various *Sāṃhitās*, with explanations from the more important *Dīgests*.

I *Initiation*

1. Virtue having become extinct among men, judicial procedure has been established and the king having the privilege of inflicting punishment, has been constituted judge of law suits.

2. Written proof and witnesses are the two expedients to be resorted to for ascertaining disputed facts in a cause between two litigants.

3 Law suits are of two kinds attended by wager, or not attended by wager attended by wager are those where it is promised in a written declaration to discharge a certain sum over and above the fine in case of defeat

4 In a law suit attended by wager the loser has to pay the wager made by himself and a fine to the king

5 But the declaration is pronounced to be the essence of a judicial proceeding if he gets the worst of it, the claimant loses his cause if he gets the better of it, he wins it

6 Family councils (*kula*) companies (of artisans), *shreni*, assemblies (of cohabitants), *gana*, an appointed judge (*adhibhita*), and the king himself are resorts for the trial of law suits and among these, the last in order is superior to the preceding

Medhatithi (Manu § 2) explains this verse, where '*shreni*' is described as 'organisation of persons belonging to the same trade, trade guilds,—'gaia', 'tribes, as 'companies of builders and other artisans' he distinguishes '*shreni*' from '*gana*' as consisting in the fact that while the former may consist of artisans working singly, the latter consists of such artisans only as work together He quotes another explanation, whereby '*kula*' stands for 'natura' or disinterested person

7 The Law, the issue of the case the conduct of the parties and an edict from the king these are the four feet of a judicial proceeding, each following is weightier than the preceding

This is quoted by the *Aparurka* (P 597)

8 Law is based upon truth the issue of the case depends upon the deposition of the witnesses, the conduct of the parties becomes manifest at the trial, the king's Edict depends upon the king's pleasure

As rendered above by Jolly, the verse does not give good sense It is read and explained by the *Aparurka* (P 597)

10 It is said to regard four, because the perpetrator of the deed, the witnesses, the judges, and the king are equally concerned by it (Ch ii 18)

11 Because it promotes justice, gain glory, renown, therefore it is said to produce four results

12 The eight constituent parts of a judicial proceeding are the king, his officer, the assessors, the law-book, the accountant, and scribe gold and fire for ordeals, and water for refreshment

13 Recovery of a Debt Deposits, Concerns among Partners, Abstraction of Gift, Breach of promised Obedience,

14 Non payment of Wages, Sale without Ownership, Non-delivery of a commodity sold, Rescission of Purchase,

15 Breach of Order, Contests about Boundaries, the Duties of Man and Wife, the Law of Inheritance, Violence,

16 Abuse and Assult, Gambling, and Miscellaneous Disputes, these are the eighteen heads of dispute

17. Of these again there are one hundred and eight subdivisions, therefore a judicial proceeding is said to have a hundred ramifications, owing to the diversity of men's claims

This verse is quoted in the Apasthaka (P 597).

18. Because it is instituted from one of these three causes love, anger, and cupidity, therefore it is said to have three causes, these are the three motives for going to law.

19. It is said to have two kinds of claims, because they rest either on suspicion or on facts, on suspicion, if the defendant has frequented bad society, on facts, if the stolen goods are produced

20. Because it concerns two parties, it is said to have two sides, of these the charge is called claim, the rejoinder answer.

21. Because both true and false statements are made in course of a judicial proceeding, it is said to have two

courses, a true statement is one agreeing with the facts, a false one is a wrong one

22 A dutiful king shall check falsehood where it has not been checked by others and strive after truth, since it is justice that happiness springs from

23 Therefore a king having seated himself on the throne of judgment, should discard interested motives, and deal even handed justice to all his subjects, as if he were Vaivasvata himself

24 He should carefully examine all claims, one after the other, according to the respective rank of the claimants, considering what would be useful or injurious, and just or unjust

25 Taking the law code for his guide, and abiding by the opinion pronounced by the chief judge

This is quoted by the Apararka (P 600) as laying down the necessity of appointing a Judge and in support of the view that if a case is being tried by the King himself, the Judge should also be there to advise him

26 Firstly, the litigants have to appear before the court, secondly the drift of their dispute has to be expounded then comes the examination and lastly the sentence, thus the trial of a law suit consists of four parts

27 The trial should be conducted discreetly and skillfully, and without neglecting either sacred or profane rules of conduct

The Apararka (P 600) quotes this in support of the view that all kinds of laws have to be considered and reconciled.

28 Where religious and secular rules are at variance the secular rules have to be put aside and the religious precepts to be followed

*Cf. Yajñavalkya—Asti lokastrattu balaved dharmashastra mithi
sthithi*

29. The law ordains to take logic for one's guide, when the sacred law cannot be applied, for the evidence in a law-suit is more decisive than the law, and overrules the law.

30. Let the judge proceed slowly in all trials relating to debt and so on, on account of the intricacy of law-cases and the insufficiency of memory.

31. If the defendant does not speak, he must be confined and punished according to law, and if he does not refute the statement of his adversary, he has to pay the money, which he is sued for.

32. A charge relating to a cow, land, gold, a woman, theft, the two kinds of insult, and violence, has to be answered immediately. [Cf. *Mitakshara*, P. 280]

33. One may wait for one day, for five, or three days, or three half-months, or seven days, if the claim relates to a debt or the like.

34. He who tries to enforce a claim, without giving notice to the king previously, shall receive a severe punishment, and his claim shall be rejected.

35. A claimant may arrest his adversary until the arrival of the summons, if the latter tries to evade the claim he is about to prefer, or does not refute his charge.

The *Aparārka* (P. 607) quotes this verse and explains 'summons' as the 'summons-bearer'.

36. Arrest is four-fold local, temporary, inhibition from travelling, and from pursuing one's occupation; and the person under arrest is not allowed to break it.

The *Aparārka* (P. 607) quotes this verse, and adds the following explanation. The arrest is 'local' when the culprit is prevented from entering certain places, it is 'temporary' when food is denied to him for a certain time,—'occupation', such as cultivating of land and so forth.

37. No culpability attaches to him who breaks an arrest put upon him while crossing a river or while passing a forest,

in an inhospitable country or, generally speaking in perilous circumstances

38 One who having been arrested at a proper time, breaks his arrest, is to be fined and one arresting improperly is liable to penalty

39 One desirous of celebrating his nuptials afflicted with an illness about to perform a sacrifice distressed sued by an other party, employed in the king's service

40 Cowherds while tending their cattle husbandmen in the act of cultivation artisans engaged in their trades soldiers engaged in warfare,

41 A minor a messenger one about to give alms or fulfilling a vow, and one surrounded by difficulties must not be arrested by the adversary nor summoned by the king

These three verses are quoted in the *Apura ta* (P 607)

42 A person arraigned not having refuted the adversary's charge cannot bring forward any claim nor is it allowed to injure one accused by another party by trying to intimidate him

43 No one must alter the charge he has brought before the judge he who rests his claim on different grounds from those first adduced by him loses his cause (Cf. *Vaidika*, P 272)

44 Nor must one bring forward a false claim for it is a sin unjustly to accuse a man the punishment inflicted in such lawsuits falls upon the claimant

45 A man may delay his answer as long as the law permits it if he does not speak in the judicial assembly, or alters his former statements it shows that he is in the wrong

46 He who does not obey the summons or having appeared before the court does not rest his cause is to be fined by the king & having lost his cause

47 After the sentence has been passed, evidence is to no purpose, unless it consist in the deposition of witnesses, or in documents, referred to in a former stage of the trial

(This is quoted in the Aparāka P 630)

48 As the powers of rain are lavished upon ripe grain, so evidence is no longer useful if once the decision has been passed

49 Even false statements are examined if made in proper time, but what is left unsaid through inadvertency has no effect even though it be true

50 He who thinks a law case to have been wrongly decided and judged, may have it tried anew, if he pays the double amount of the fine inflicted

51 If an unjust sentence has been passed, the judges have to pay the fine for nobody certainly commits an offence without being liable to punishment for it

52 Whether it be through passion, ignorance, or avarice, that a judge pronounces an unfair opinion, he must be considered as no assessor of the court, and the king should severely punish that sinful man

53 But a king especially, who is careful to discharge his duty, must endeavour to distinguish right from wrong, because human minds are subtle

54 There are men who bear false testimony from avarice, and there are other wicked men who forge written documents

55 Therefore both documents and witnesses have to be carefully examined by the king, the former by inquiring into the condition of the writing, the latter by inquiring into the nature of their deposition

56. There are skilful men who imitate the hand writing of others, therefore similarity of handwriting affords no conclusive proof

57 Liars may have the bearing of veracious men, and veracious men look like liars Men in general appear in various shapes, thus caution is required

58 Hence it is right to examine a fact strictly, even though it occurred in the inquirer's own sight He who ascertains facts by rigid investigation, does not deviate from justice

Additional verses (not translated by Jolly) quoted and explained in the Apararka -

1 'No law suit shall be admitted—which is filed by one against several persons, or which is filed against women or slaves, or that between teacher and his pupil, or between father and son, or between husband and wife, or between master and servant,—and it adds the following explanations — One man cannot sue several persons simultaneously, if he has claims against several persons, he should file them separately,—if one has claims against women he shall sue their guardians but milkmaids and women selling wine may be sued by themselves —similarly for claims against slaves, their masters have to be sued —If the pupil has been chastised by the Teacher in accordance with law, it is not open to the pupil to prefer against him a charge of assault Similarly in the case of father and son (P 610)

2 'Before the Defendant has filed his answer, the Plaintiff shall set forth in writing all that he desires to state' (P 611)

3 'That man should be permitted to make his statement first whose suffering may be greatest, or whose suit may be most important,—not necessarily one who has filed his suit first (P 611)

4 'When the Plaintiff has stated his claim, the Defendant should state his answer traversing the claim, which

should be firm, definite, consistent, set forth in clear language,—i.e in words which do not stand in need of amplifications or explanations

5 'This answer may be in the form of (1) Denial ('The claim is untrue — I know nothing of this claim —'I was not present at the time of the transaction —'I was not even born at the time)—or (2) Admission (of the truthfulness of the claim),—or (3) Confutation—admitting the claim but *confuting* it (as already paid)—or (4) Citation of a Previous Decision (Pp 612 613)

6 'In criminal cases, the person who committed the offence first should be punished more heavily, where the two parties assaulted each other simultaneously, the punishment should be equal' (P 617)

7 'A party is *non suited* in four ways (1) By making an answer which does not touch the claim, (2) by vitiating the proceedings, (3) by not answering the summons, (4) by not making an answer, and (5) by absconding after being summoned'. (P 621)

[What is meant by 'vitiating the proceedings' is explained in the following verse —]

8 'Even on the clear presentation of facts, if he does not accept it,—after having denied a fact, if he reverts to it,—after having declared that he has witnesses in support of his contention, if he fails to name them,—the party should be declared *non suited*' (PP 621-622)

9 'If the parties should come to a mutual understanding, after the suit has been filed, and the Plaintiff and the Answer duly presented,—they should be fined double the amount of the claim' (P 622)

10 'In a case where several claims have been filed against a man, and he has denied all of them,—if only a part of the claim is substantiated, the man should be made to make good all the claims'. (P. 625)

II

On Courts of Justice

1 One who is not appointed to be a member of the court must on no account speak at the trial of a law-suit, but by him, who has been appointed, an impartial opinion ought to be given

2 Whether appointed or not appointed, one who is conversant with the law has a right to speak, for he whose conduct is regulated by the law, delivers a speech inspired by the deity

This verse is quoted by the Aparârka (P. 604).

3 For the trial of all law suits persons familiar with many branches of science should be appointed, no prudent man would entrust this task to a single person, though a virtuous one

4 Whatever judgment ten men versed in the Veda and jurisprudence, or three men familiar with the Veda, pass upon the case in hand, is right and valid sentence

5 The king alone, being the supreme ruler, is entitled to decide knotty law cases, therefore private man should not pass a sentence alone, his opinion would leave room for doubt

6 The king should appoint, as members of the court, honest men of tried integrity, who are able to support the burden of the administration of justice like bulls bearing heavy load

7 The assessors of the king's courts of judicature should be men skilled in matters of law, sprung from good families, veracious, and impartial towards friend and foe

8. Either the court must not be entered, or law and truth must be openly declared but that man is a criminal who either says nothing, or speaks falsely

9. But judges who, after having repaired to the court, sit there in silent meditation, and do not deliver a candid opinion, as they ought are all guilty of a deliberate falsehood

10. One quarter of the iniquity committed falls upon the party in a cause, one quarter on his witnesses, one quarter upon all the assessors of the court, and one quarter on the king

11. Therefore should a judge, when he has entered the court, divest himself from both love and hatred, and deliver a fair opinion, in order that he may not go to hell

12. The king is blameless, the judges are absolved from iniquity, the sin falls upon the sinner's head alone, when those who deserve punishment receive it

13. When all the members of a judicial assembly opine, "this is right," the court is relieved from the dart of iniquity, but the dart remains in the wound, if they do not say so

14. That is not a judicial assembly where the elders are missing, nor are they elders who do not pronounce a just opinion, nor is that a just opinion which is against equity, nor is that equitable which is contaminated with fraud

III

On Evidence by writing

1. Written proof, witnesses, and possession, these are the three kinds of evidence, on which the right of property rests, and by means of which a creditor may recover his loan

2. A document remains always evidence, witnesses as long as they live, and possession becomes evidence after a lapse of time thus it is propounded in the law-books

3 What a man is not possessed of, that is not his own, even though there be written proof, and even though witnesses be living, this is especially the case with immovables

4 If a man foolishly suffers his property to be enjoyed by strangers, it will become those strangers' own through the effect of possession, although the proprietor is known to be alive

5 Whatever property a proprietor sees with his own eyes being enjoyed by strangers, without for ten years asserting his rights, may not be recovered by him

6 Because he has been indulgent and looking on without asserting his rights, therefore he will be nonsuited, if (cf C13) he prefers a claim after the expiration of the above mentioned period

7 If he is neither an idiot nor a mere child, and if the chattel is being enjoyed by a stranger while he is near, his property in it is extinct by law, and the adverse possessor shall keep it

8 Pledges, boundaries, the property of children, common deposits sealed deposits, women and goods belonging to the king or learned Brahmins are not lost to the owner through their being possessed by a stranger

9 Even pledges etc , are lost, if strangers have enjoyed them for twenty years before the owner's eyes, the property of women and of kings is excepted from this rule

10 The property of women and of kings can never be lost, even though it be enjoyed for hundreds of years by strangers who have no title to it

11 Where possession exists, but not title whatever exists, there a title, but not possession alone, can confer proprietary rights

12 A title having been substantiated, the possession becomes valid it remains invalid without a proved title

13 He who simply declares himself possessed of a commodity without having a title to it is to be considered as a thief, in consequence of his pleading such illegitimate possession

14 He who enjoys without a title for ever so many years, the king of the land should inflict on that sinner the punishment of a thief

15 What a man possesses without a title, he must not alienate, being only the possessor of it, but after the death of the possessor such possessions devolve upon his family

16 In cases falling within the memory of man, possession of land with a title makes evidence In cases extending beyond the memory of man, the hereditary succession of three ancestors is admitted as evidence, though the title be not produced

17 If a man is accused by him whom he has injured by taking possession of his property, he cannot escape defeat, only what has formerly been possessed by his fathers, and inherited by him in order, is his legitimate property

18 When possession has been held, even unlawfully, by three ancestors, including the father of the present occupant, that cannot be taken away from him, as having gone in order through three lives [This is quoted by Medhātithi on Manu § 148],

19 Common deposits (*anvahita*), stolen goods (*hita*), unspecified deposits (*nyasta*), deposits for whose delivery a certain period has been fixed (?) (*balastavabdhay uttamam*), and what is being possessed in secret ('*apratjakṣam jad bhuktam*'), are six things possessed without a title

[Jolly's rendering is defective Medhātithi (on Manu

8 148) has explained this verse as follows ‘*antithita*’ is that deposit which is fraudulent what is actually deposited being different from what has been previously shown —‘*hrtam*’ is what is *stolen* by breaking open a wall etc , while ‘*bivalavastabha*’ is what is robbed by open violence ‘*yachita*’ is what is obtained by begging ‘*nyasta*’ and ‘*apratyakṣam*’ are as rendered by Jolly]

20 If a litigant dies while a law suit about possessions of his is pending the son has to prove his title, the fact of his possession being insufficient to decide the suit

21 What has been in the hands of three ancestors for a very long time though they had no title cannot be lost, having gone in order through three lives

22 After the death of a creditor, even witnesses are no longer of avail, except if a statement made by the creditor himself on his death bed has been preserved

23 For after the death of an adversary the deposition of his witnesses loses its force an attested document only being capable of influencing the sentence in this case

24 But if a man not unsound in mind has preferred a legitimate claim, a witness may give evidence even after the claimant's death, in case it be in a matter touching the six cases of deposit and the rest

25 In all business transactions the latest act shall prevail but in the case of a gift a pledge, or a purchase, the prior act has the greater force

26 A contract of delivery and receipt may be made, with a view to guns by the lender on the principal sum while remaining with the debtor it is called a loan on interest, and money lenders acquire their substance by it

27 What is given by force, what is by force enjoyed,

by force caused to be written and all other things done by force, Manu has pronounced void

28 If the creditor's claim ceases to be admissible through length of time, he may still substantiate it by means of a document if his tribe acknowledge his claim, or if he has a pledge or can prove occupancy of the land in question

29 Written proof is declared to be of two sorts, the first, in the handwriting of the party himself the second, in that of another person the former being valid without subscribing witnesses the latter requiring to be attested the validity of both depends on the usage established in the country

30 That instrument which is not adverse to peculiar local usages which declares the nature of the pledge made, and which is consistent in import and language, is termed proof

31 That instrument is not termed proof, which is executed by a person intoxicated by one under duress, by a female, by a child and that which is effected by force, by intimidation, and by fraud

32 A written contract loses its validity in that case also, if the witnesses, creditor, debtor, and writer be dead, unless its validity be insured by means of a pledge

33 If anything has been received or a public announcement been made, a contract retains its validity even after the death of the witnesses

34 Pledges are declared to be of two sorts, movable and immovable both are valid when there is actual enjoyment, and not otherwise

35 An instrument which has been produced in due season, proclaimed in public, and repeatedly called into

remembrance, remains always evidence even after the death of the witnesses

36 An instrument, whose purport nobody has heard of, which has remained unknown, or become the object of a law suit, has no validity, not even while the witnesses are living

37 In the case of an instrument being deposited in another country, or burnt, or badly written, or stolen, time must be allowed, if it be in existence, if it be so in existence, the evidence of those who have seen it must be resorted to

38 If there exist doubts about a document, whether it be genuine or not, its authenticity must be proved by the handwriting of the party himself, by evidence of the contract, which it records, by peculiar marks and by reasonable inference

39 If a document bears the name of a stranger and is designed for a different purpose, its authenticity has to be established with especial care by examining the connexion and former dealings of the two parties

40 A document written by the party himself must be authenticated by examining the writing, and an attested document be unauthenticated by examining the witnesses. Witnesses are overruled by documents, not documents by witnesses

41 If a document is split in two or torn, or stolen, or effaced, or destroyed, or badly written, another document must be executed. This is the rule regarding documents

IV

On Evidence by Witnesses and by Ordeal

1 In doubtful cases, when there are two conflicting parties, the facts have to be ascertained by the deposition of witnesses, as to what was seen, heard or understood by them

2 He has to be considered as a witness who has witnessed a deed with his ears or eyes, with his ears if the perpetrator of the deed has been speaking, with his eyes, if he has been committing an action

3 Eleven descriptions of witnesses are recognised in law by the learned five of which are made and the remaining six are not made

4 A witness by record, by memory, by accident, by secrecy, and by corroboration these are the five classes of made witnesses

5 But the witnesses not made have been declared by the wise to be six fold of which three are not appointed

6 The fellow villagers a judge, a kindred, one authorized to manage the affairs of the parties, one deputed by the claimant

7 In family disputes, persons of the same family shall be witnesses A smaller number of witnesses than three is objectionable and they should be blameless, decent and intelligent persons

8 They may be either Brahmans, or Vaishyas or Kṣattriyas or else unimpeachable Shudras Each of these shall be witness for persons of his own order, or for any order, if there are no witnesses of the same order

9 Among companies of artisans men who are artisans shall be witnesses and men of one tribe among those of the same, foresters among those living outside and women among women

10 And if in any association etc , any one falls out with his associates, he shall not bear testimony with regard to them for they are all his enemies

11 The incompetent witnesses too have in the law books been declared by the learned to be of five sorts, by reason of interdict, of delinquency, of contradiction, of voluntary deposition and of intervening decease

12 Learned Brahmins, etc, by interdict, thieves, etc if their delinquency has become public, by reason of contradiction, i.e if there is no agreement between the witnesses in a law suit

13 Voluntary deposition is when a man comes and offers his evidence without having been asked to do so Incompetent by intervening decease are all witnesses after the death of the claimant, except those instructed by him on the point of death

14 Learned Brahmins, ascetics, superannuated persons and religious devotees, are those incapacitated by interdict there is no other reason given for it

15 Thieves, public offenders, violent persons, gamblers, murderers, are incompetent from delinquency there is no truth in them

16 If the statements of witnesses, who have been summoned by the king for the decision of an action, do not agree, they are rendered incompetent by contradiction

17 He who, without having been appointed, comes and offers his evidence, is termed a spy in the law books he is not worthy to bear testimony

18 How can any person bear testimony, if the claimant is no longer in existence, whose claim should have been heard ? Such a person is an incompetent witness by reason of intervening decease

19 If both parties in a dispute have witnesses, the witnesses of that party shall be heard which has brought forward the claim

(This is quoted by the *Apararka* P 624)

20 In such cases only, where the claimant is worsted in the trial, the witnesses of the defendant have to be examined

(This is quoted in the *Apararka* P. 624)

21 For the defendant answers word for word to the charge brought forward by his adversary and indicating every error in the assertions of the latter, he points out the true state of the case

22 No one should secretly confer with a witness summoned by his adversary neither should he cause him to differ with another person resorting to such practices lose his suit

23 If a witness dies or goes abroad after having received the summons those who have heard his deposition may give evidence for a second hind statement is evidence also

24 Even after a great lapse of time a written document does not lose its validity if a man can write, he should commit it to writing himself if he cannot write himself he should not cause it to be written by others

25 The deposition of witness by record remains valid up to the eighth year, that of a witness come by accident remain valid up to the fifth year

26 The deposition of a secret witness remains valid up to the third year the deposition of a witness by corroborator is declared to lose its validity after one year

27 Or no definite period is adhered to in judging the validity of a deposition for those learned in law have said that testimony depends upon memory

28 He whose intellect, memory, or hearing, has never been deranged may give valid evidence even after a very considerable lapse of time

29 But six different kinds of law cases have been indicated by the wise in which witnesses are not concerned evident signs take in these cases the place of the deposition of witnesses

30 One taken with a firebrand in his hand is manifestly an incendiary one taken with a weapon in his hand is

known to be a murderer, if a man and another man's wife are seen to play with one another's hair, the man must be an adulterer

31. One who goes about with a hatchet in his hand, is a destroyer of bridges, one who is carrying an axe, is a destroyer of trees

32 One covered with hideous marks is a public offender In ill such cases witnesses are superfluous, only in the last mentioned case of violence close scrutiny is required

33 Some one might make marks upon his person on purpose to injure an enemy Therefore persons of acute perception should investigate such cases

34 One interested in the subject matter, a friend, a servant, an enemy, one perjured, a sick or infamous person, cannot be made a witness

35 The king cannot be made a witness, nor mean artificers, nor public dancers and singers nor a slave, nor a cheat, nor one exhausted nor a decrepit old man, nor a woman, nor a child, nor a potter

36 Nor can the following persons be made witnesses one intoxicated, a madman, a negligent or distressed person, one extremely grieved, a gamester, a village priest, one who is gone out upon a long pilgrimage, one engaged in transmarine commerce, an ascetic, a scholar,

37 One deformed, a single person, a learned Brahman, a man of a vile class, an eunuch, a public dancer or singer, an atheist, an apostate, one who has deserted his wife or his holy fire, one who makes illicit offerings,

38 One who eats from the same dish as the defendant in a law suit a servant, a member of the highest class, kinsmen, one formerly perjured a dancer, one who lives by selling poison (?), a snake catcher,

39 A poisoner, an incendiary, a butcher, the son of a Shudri, one excluded from society, one oppressed by

fatigue, a public offender, one exhausted, one who has suffered his fire to go out,

40 One who associates with people of wicked habits, an idiot, a seller of oil or roots, one who is possessed by a demon, an enemy of the king, weather prophets, and astrologers

41 A juggler, an avaricious or cruel person, enemies of a company of merchants, or an association of kinsmen, an irreligious man, one self sold one who has a limb too little, a Bhagavritti

42 One who has bad nails or black teeth, a leper, one who betrays his friends, an idiot, a seller of spirits, a murderer, a leather manufacturer, a lame man, an outcast, a forger,

43 An impostor, one who has eaten too much, a robber, a follower of the king,

44 One who sells men, animals, meat, bones, honey, milk, water, or butter, a Brahman, and a member of a twice born class who is guilty of usury,

45 A man sprung from a good family, who neglects the duties of his class, a panegyrist, one who serves low people, one who quarrels with his father, and a mischief maker.

46 Nor a child, a woman one man alone, an evildoer, relatives, and enemies, because they would bear false testimony

47. A child would speak falsely from ignorance, a woman from levity, an evildoer from habitual depravity, relatives from affection, enemies from desire of revenge

48 By consent of both litigants even a single person may be a witness, and must be examined before the court

49 One who is oppressed by the conscience of his

separately, all of them familiar with the rules of duty and acquainted with the circumstances of the case

59 Let him cause a priest to swear by his veracity, a Ksattriya by his horse or elephant and his weapons, a Vaishya by his kine grain or gold a Shudra by all possible crimes

60 By ancient holy texts which extol the pre eminence of truth and denounce falsehood, let him inspire them with deep awe

61 If there be contradictory evidence the plurality of witnesses decides the case if the number of witnesses on both sides in a law case is found to be equal, the defendant must be absolved

62 The deposition of the witnesses loses its validity in this case on account of the subtlety of evidence by witnesses But if a litigant is, by the act of fate abandoned by his witnesses in a law suit

63 The wise will not have him absolved even through

guilty looks as if he was ill, is constantly shifting his position, and runs after every man,

50 Who suddenly coughs without reason, and draws repeated sighs, who scratches as if writing with his feet and who shakes his arm and clothes,

51 Whose countenance changes colour, whose fore head sweats, and whose lips become dry, who looks above and about him

52 Who talks a great deal without restraint like a man in haste, and without being asked such a person is manifestly a false witness, and should receive severe punishment

53 The above mentioned persons slaves, impostors, and the like, shall nevertheless be admitted to bear testimony, with due consideration of the weight of the case in hand

54 In all cases of violence, theft, adultery, and both kinds of insult the witnesses should not be scrutinised

55 He who does not give his evidence, although he has related what he knows to others, deserves extreme punishment for he is worse than a false witness

56 If a witness speaks falsely through covetousness, he shall be fined a thousand pinas, if through distraction of mind, two hundred and fifty, or the lowest imercement, if through terror, the middling imercement, if through friend ship, four times the lowest,

57 If through lust, ten times the lowest imercement, if through wrath, three times the next or middlemost, if through ignorance, two hundred complete if through inattention, a hundred only

58 The judge, having summoned the witnesses, and bound them down firmly by an oath, shall examine them

separately, all of them familiar with the rules of duty and acquainted with the circumstances of the case.

59. Let him cause a priest to swear by his veracity, a Ksattriya by his horse or elephant and his weapons, a Vaishya by his kine, grain, or gold, a Shudra by all possible crimes.

60. By ancient holy texts, which extol the pre-eminence of truth and denounce falsehood, let him inspire them with deep awe

61 If there be contradictory evidence, the plurality of witnesses decides the case, if the number of witnesses on both sides in a law-case is found to be equal, the defendant must be absolved.

62. The deposition of the witnesses loses its validity in this case on account of the subtlety of evidence by witnesses. But if a litigant is, by the act of fate, abandoned by his witnesses in a law-suit,

63. The wise will not have him absolved even through an ordeal. If a witness gives unmeaning evidence, the deposition of the appointed witnesses being full of meaning, his testimony is as good as ungiven .

64. If the witnesses were to disagree with one another as to place, time, age, matter, usages, tribe, or class,

65. Such depositions, too, are worthless. If the witnesses name too low or too high a sum,

66. This too must be known to make no evidence. This is the rule of witnesses.

67. If, owing to the negligence of the creditor, both a written contract and witnesses are missing, and the defendant denies his obligation, three kinds of measures may be had recourse to:

68. Repeated admonitions, subtle ratiocination, and,

thirdly, an oath . these are the measures which a judge should successively resort to.

69. He who does not refute his adversary's statements, though he has been called upon to do so repeatedly, three or four or five times, will consequently be bound to pay the debt.

70. If the defendant has resisted such an admonition, he shall aggress him by subtle ratiocination founded upon place, time, and matter, upon the connexions of the party, circumstantial evidence, the nature of the case, and so forth.

71. If reasonable inference also leads to no result, let him cause the defendant to undergo one of the ordeals, by fire, water, proof of virtue, and so forth, according to the time of the year and to the strength of the defendant.

72. He whom the blazing fire burns not, whom the water soon forces not up, or who meets with no speedy misfortune, must be held veracious in his testimony on oath.

He is freed from the charge; otherwise he is guilty.

73. Let ordeals be administered if an offence has been committed in a solitary forest, at night, in the interior of a house, and in cases of violence, and of denial of a deposit.

74. The same rule holds good in regard to women accused of bad morals, in cases of theft and robbery, and in all cases of denial of an obligation

III.—THEISM IN ANCIENT INDIA

By GOPI NATH KAVIRAJ

Part II

The Non theistic Systems

I have given in the foregoing pages a bare outline of the different theories relating to the origin of things. I now propose to deal more particularly with the principal notions of some of the recognized schools of non theistical philosophy which bear, directly or in a remote way, on the problem of Theism. An exhaustive treatment of the subject is *prima facie* impossible within the compass of these pages, but I have nevertheless endeavoured not to exclude from my scope or dismiss unexamined any of the more important doctrines.

A The Charvaka view

First and foremost among the philosophies which deny the existence of a Personal God stands the material school of the Charvakas. Though this school of thought owing to its gross sensationalism had never succeeded in striking its roots deep into the soil of the country it still possessed an interest, almost unique in character partly theoretical—in the eyes of controversialists, and partly even practical, though only to a very limited number. Its doctrines if doctrines they could it all be called, were most mercilessly exposed by all the other systems, orthodox as well as heterodox and if they have survived to day they have done so simply as so many ill formulated theses without any pretension to speculative value.

The founder Tradition ascribes to Brihaspati the foundation of the philosophy of materialism*. An adherent of this school of thought is therefore usually known as Bārhaspatya. Cf. Vivaraṇa Praimēya Saṅgraha, pp. 210—18; Saṃvadāraśana Saṅgraha (Poona Ed.), p. 4. That Brihaspati was not a mythical personage is evident from the Sūtras extant in quotation under his name:

Cf. (1) Bhāskara Bhāṣya on the Vedānta Sūtra 3.3.53

(a) पृथिव्यप्तेजोवायुरिति तत्त्वानि ।†

(b) तत्समुदाये शरीरेन्द्रियविषयसंज्ञा ।

(c) तेभ्यश्चैततन्यम् ।

(d) किएवादेभ्यो मदशक्तिवद् विज्ञानम् ।

(2) Sankara's commentary on the Vedānta Sūtra 3.3.53:

(a) तेभ्यश्चैततन्यम् ।

(b) मदशक्तिवद् विज्ञानम् ।

(c) चैततन्यविधिष्टः कायः पुरुषः ।‡

* It is hard to say anything conclusively in regard to the identity of this Brihaspati with the scholar of the same name who is associated with the foundation of a school of politics. Bhāsa in the Pratimā (5th Act) and Kautilya in his Arthaśāstra refer, the latter very frequently, to Brihaspati as the author of an Arthaśāstra; and it is interesting to observe that in the इषासमुद्ग section of Kautilya's work (Mysore Ed. p. 6) where the views of different Ācharyas are cited as to the number and names of sciences fit for study Brihaspati is quoted as holding that वार्ता and दण्डगात्रि are the only branches of knowledge which deserve to be specially cultivated: वार्तांशक्ति and त्रयी— the sciences dealing with the supersensuous—are ignored as of subsidiary importance. May not this be a fact of some historical significance?

† Noted in the Bhāṣati, Nir. Ed., p. 767.

‡ These 3 Sūtras occur elsewhere also; Varadarāja in his Kusumāñjali Bodhāṇi quotes the Sūtra marked (b) in the same form; the Sūtra defining the Self appears also in the same form in the Gīti Bhāṣya of Sankara (18 5.) and Śiva Sūtra and with slight verbal alterations in the Pratyabhijñāhṛidaya (under Sūtra 5), thus: वरदाराजेऽपौर्माण्यः ।

(3) Nilakantha on the Gita.

- (a) चैतन्यविशिष्टः काय. पुरुषः ।
- (b) काम एवैक. पुरुषार्थः ।

(The last 2 Sūtras are also quoted by Madhusūdana, Nilakantha and Dhanapati in their commentaries on the Gita (16-11)

(4) Sadananda in the Advaita Brahmasiddhi:

- (a) चैतन्यविशिष्ट कायः पुरुषः ।
- (b) काम एवैकः पुरुषार्थ ।
- (c) मरणमेवापवर्ग ।

We have already dealt at some length with this view in the doctrines the preceding pages where we observed that it had been one of the main dogmas of the Lokāyatika sect. We now pass on hurriedly to describe some of the other tenets of the school.

Among these we may mention first of all the doctrine of the four elements. The Chārvakas believed, very much like the Buddhist Philosophers, that Akāsa was not an element at all, it was a Void, an absence of आवरण. Only the four elements in their atomic condition were held to be the basic (root) principles in Creation. The external world, the sense organs as well as the physical organisms were supposed to be the products of these primordial types of matter. But how this production comes to be possible is a question left unexplained. All kinds of causes, known or unknown (शब्दः), being rejected, and the guidance of an Eternal Intelligence being regarded as superfluous the materialist is left with the only alternative open to him, viz to say that this production results from the fortuitous concourse of the blind constitutive particles of matter. Nothing further can be said on this head. It would be illegitimate, so it is urged, to demand an explanation where no explanation can be given.

To the Materialists Life and Consciousness are practically equivalent, and are both believed to originate from Matter. Sentience and the phenomenon of mental life are material properties and need not imply a distinct immaterial substance as the Self. It is admittedly true that Consciousness is not observed to inhere in the particles of matter either severally* or even collectively, but this is no argument against the fact that when these particles come to be arranged into a specific form in a manner not yet scientifically explicable they are found to show signs of life. This peculiar collocation of the atoms results in the formation of the organism (शरीर).† This is the Self (आत्मा).

That consciousness is a function of the body may be proved by a process of logical demonstration, e.g. by the joint methods of Agreement and Difference (अन्वय and व्यतिरेक) (a) Thus we find by observation, and there is no instance to the contrary that for the manifestation of consciousness body is an inalienable factor and that discarnate consciousness is not possible. This shows that between organism and consciousness there exists some necessary bond, viz that of Causality (b) And Universal experience as expressed in judgments like I feel hot, I feel tired seems to vouch for the truth of this view. It is an indisputable fact that sensations and perceptions can arise only in so far as they are conditioned by a bodily mechanism. But it would not be

* It appears that some of the older materialists did actually attribute consciousness to each of the atoms. But the view does not seem to have obtained currency.

† As to how this peculiar collocation or organisation results it is answered that the union of parents is the immediate cause and as a period of Universal Dissolution is not admitted the difficulty about the first origin of Life and Consciousness does not arise. Brahmananda's Com. on Siddhanta bindu, p. 62.

so were not the body the substrate of consciousness (c) Apart from this there is another proof in favour of the causal relation between Matter and Consciousness This is afforded by the description in medical literature of the properties of particular preparations of food and drink e.g. Brahm ghrita) conducive to the development of the intellectual powers *

(1) First, since the body is declared to be the agent of actions (कर्ता) of all actions it should on grounds of logical consistency, be held morally responsible for their natural consequences But this is scarcely possible (1) The particles which go to the formation of the body are always in a state of flux so that the body which performs an action (कर्म) at one moment does no longer persist at the next to feel its reaction (भोग) (b) And even if this *momentary* fluctuation be not admitted it is nevertheless undeniable that the body suffers change the bodies in two different periods of life are different from each other, for otherwise they could not have different sizes The appearance of a different size implies that the former size is destroyed which is possible only when the subject in which it resides (i.e पूर्वशरीर) is also destroyed

(ii) Secondly, the material theory is incompetent to account for the facts of memory and recognition (स्मृति & प्रत्याभिज्ञा) Necessity of thought demands that memory and the original experience (अनुभव) which gives rise to it should be referred to one and the same conscious subject but this identity of reference would not be possible if the subject were not fundamentally an unchangeable unity

To these alleged objections the Charvaka replies that they are more apparent than real For the second difficulty may be easily got over by supposing that the traces (स्मृति) left by previous experiences are capable of being transmitted

* See Nyayama jari, pp 439—440

(संक्रम) from the prior moment to the succeeding moment i e from the material cause (उपादान) down to its direct product (उपादेय)

As to how this may be possible one may consider, the Chārvāka says, the analogous instance of the transference of the odour of musk to the cloth in contact with it. Here the only condition observed to be necessary is the presence of a relation between the two objects. And between a cause and its effect—the case under consideration—such a relation does undoubtedly exist. The unity of reference may also be ensured by the admission that the impressions, though transferrable, do pertain to, i e are preserved and revived (reproduced) in, a single line or Causal series.

As regards the first point the position of the Chārvāka prevents him from recognising its cogency as an objection. An inveterate foe of the doctrine of Adṛṣṭa he finds no justice, natural or moral, in the government of the Universe, so that the very question of the necessity of logically unifying *Karma* with its *phala* does not appear to him as a problem calling for solution. Bhoga—the experience of pleasure and pain is not determined by a previous *Karma* (पूर्व कर्म), but comes by Chance (यदृच्छा) over which there is no control. This being so, the subjective unity sought for to explain the synthesis of cause and effect needs hardly a ground for establishment *

But even if it were needed we could find it in the unity of the organism. Recognition testifies to the identity of the body through all its changing states and this recognition can not be pronounced false as in the case of nails pared and renewed, for there is no chance here as in the example cited of the body being once destroyed and then substituted by a fresh

*This frame of mind will make intelligible the principles of conduct involved in teachings like कृष्ण गुरुवा वृद्धि ।१६७ etc

one of a similar kind. The fact of recognition which is brought forward as subversive of the alleged momentariness of an object appearing once in consciousness is fatal also to the mutability of the organism *

Besides the above, there are three more views of the material school according as the Self is identified with (1) the sense organs (**इन्द्रिय**), with (2) the principle of Life (**प्राण**), or with (3) Mind (**मन**)

The advocates of the first view set forth that the senses are really the intra organic conscious agents. This view is based on the facts that consciousness and bodily movements (**चेष्टा**) follow from the initiation of the senses and that the judgments expressed in 'I am blind &c' showing the identity of the Self with the sense organs are universally accepted as valid. Vatsyayana thus describes the view
तानींद्रियाणीमानि स्वस्वविषयग्रहणाच्चेतनानि, इन्द्रियाणा भावाभावयोर्विषयग्रहणस्य तथा भावात् । एवं सति किमन्येन चेतनेन । (3 1 2)*

The second view consists in maintaining that as the senses depend for existence and operation on the Vital Principle this principle itself is really the source of intelligence. The fact that the presence and absence of the senses involve the origin and non origin of knowledge does not necessarily point to their agency, the fact may be equally explained on the hypothesis of their instrumentality. Moreover, if agency were to be assigned to the senses there would ensure an

*Nyayamajjati, p 437, lines 16-19

† Cf also Vedanta Sara (Jiva Ed., 1914) pp 93, 96, Siddhanta bindu, with Ratnavali (Adv. Mañj Ed.), pp 56-57, 63 64, and more particularly Vivarana Prameyasangraha, p 181 lines 13-23

insurmountable difficulty in consequence of the absence of organs about the origin of action. Again, the question arises which of the senses is the agent—each of them severally or all combined. In the former case, is the agency simultaneous or successive? Now it is absurd to think that the agency belongs to all the senses indifferently for the object of one sense never becomes cognisable to another and the senses are never known to work concurrently in producing an effect. The alternative of simultaneity is of course out of the question. As to the remaining contention that each of the senses may be an agent *in succession*, the reply is if each of these be an absolutely independent agent as asserted, it is likely that in case of conflicting movements due to varied resolutions the balance of the whole bodily organism should be upset, but this is never known to happen. But if the senses were subservient in their functions to the guidance of a Superior Entity it would be reasonable to hold this latter to be the true Self rather than the senses. This Entity is Prin*i*, the principle of Persistence during Sleep and Wakeful Condition alike*

Finally, we may mention the view which claims that Consciousness is a quality of the Mind† Brahmananda, in his commentary on the Siddhanta bindu (Advaita Manjari Ed., p. 57), explains the grounds on which this theory is founded, stating that the other organs are only the means of indeterminate sense knowledge (नियिकल्पक ज्ञान), but it is mind

*Vidvanmanorajini (Jya Ed., 1915, pp. 96-97) Cf Brahmananda's Com. on Siddhantabindu, p. 57 lines 13-14

†See Vedānta Sara p. 97, Nyaya Sutra 3:16, Nyaya Kandali, p. 72, 25-26 Nyayamanjari p. 441, Vivarana Prameya Sangraha pp. 181-182. This old materialistic doctrine of मन अतन्य was recently revived with fresh vigour by the late Mr. Rakhsila Dasa Nyayaratna, see his *Lattasra* with his own commentary as well as its refutation by Pandit Hari Dasa Sastri M.A.

alone that introduces into such knowledge the element of determinateness. For this reason, as well as because it controls by virtue of its power of Volition (सङ्कृत्य) the outer organs and may persist and function singly even when the latter happen to be absent (e. g. on the plane of existence called *Svapna*), the Mind is the true Self.

In these different views there is perfect agreement as to the number of *pramāṇas* recognised, for all of them admit that perception is the only way of gaining a right knowledge of things. Inference is not a valid proof, in as much as the Universal and Necessary relation on which it is based cannot be discovered. In other words, it is practically impossible and logically incongruous to ascend, merely by a process of multiplication of individual instances (भूयोदर्शन) from limited sense-experience to a knowledge of Universal Truths (सर्वोप-संदारणी व्याप्ति). Bare enumeration of facts, however far it may be carried, hardly suffices to find out the element of Necessity involved in generalisations. Perception is unable to establish the truth of Induction. For though perception may tell us e. g. that *this* particular A is related to *this* particular B this knowledge would hardly justify its extension in the form of 'all A's are related to B's.' What right have we, with the limited faculties at our command, to jump into the Unknown and assert a Categorical Universal proposition? Moreover, the assertion of such a proposition would presuppose the elimination of all accidental factors (उपाधि निष्पत्त). But how is the absence of these factors to be made known? Perception would not wait where these are by nature supersensuous, and the validity of inference as a proof has been already controverted. There would thus cling an abiding suspicion, not removable by any means accessible to man, as to the truth of every universal judgment.

Thus according to the Charvaka perception being the only criterion of existence whatever is not perceived is held to have no existence at all यज्ञोपलङ्घते तन्नास्ति This view naturally leads up to scepticism But for practical purposes probability (समाधान) alone is sufficient* Thus at the sight of smoke rising from a certain place there arises in the mind a sense of the *probability* of fire and not of its *certainity*, and this is enough for all practical purposes For this end there is no need to assume the existence of a distinct kind of evidence, called Inference The notion of pramaṇa is being the basis of certain knowledge is due to Chance Coincidence (संघाद) between the knowledge which led to the activity (प्रवृत्तक शान) and the attainment of the object in which the activity is fulfilled (प्रवृत्तिसामर्थ्य) i.e. harmony between thought and object

From the above sketch of the philosophical notions of the materialists it can well be seen why there is no room for God in this system The usual arguments held out by the theists have not for them the force of persuasion And if even the principle of physical causality being denied it is idle to urge they would say, that God is the moral Governor of the world adjusting the *Karmas* of the jīvas or that He is the Universal Agent—the author of the contingent phenomena And to one to whom the Vedas reveal no signs of infallibility it is equally

vain to attempt showing that from them the existence of a Omniscient Spirit could be inferred. And last but not least, Inference itself (अनुमान) is denied. The senses do not confessedly reach Him and verbal testimony falls under the category of inference. There is no means of ascertaining, therefore, that an all-knowing, all-powerful spirit exists. Nature (स्वभाव), and not God, is the watch-word of this school*.

(To be continued)

*

*The position of the Lokayatikas is thus summarised in the Vivarana Prameya Sangraha, p. 311, : भूतव्यज्ञेयं तत्त्वं प्रयत्नेयं नाम, स्वभावाद् च वास्तविकः ।

Thus according to the Chārvāka perception being the only criterion of existence whatever is not perceived is held to have no existence at all यन्मोपलभ्यते तत्प्राप्तिः This view naturally leads up to scepticism But for practical purposes probability (संभावना) alone is sufficient* Thus at the sight of smoke rising from a certain place there arises in the mind a sense of the *probability* of fire, and not of its *certainty*, and this is enough for all practical purposes For this end there is no need to assume the existence of a distinct kind of evidence, called Inference The notion of pramāna as being the basis of certain knowledge is due to Chance Coincidence (संचाद) between the knowledge which led to the activity (प्रवृत्तक ज्ञान) and the attainment of the object in which the activity is fulfilled (प्रवृत्तिसामर्थ्य), i.e. harmony between thought and object

From the above sketch of the philosophical notions of the materialists it can well be seen why there is no room for God in this system. The usual arguments held out by the theists have not for them the force of persuasion. Adṛṣṭa or even the principle of physical causality being denied, it is idle to argue, they would say, that God is the moral Governor of the world adjusting the *Karmas* of the jivas, or that He is the Universal Agent—the author of the contingent phenomena. And to one to whom the Vedas reveal no signs of infallibility it is equally

*So far this view is exactly what Arcesilaus is said to have asserted in reply to the Stoic's objection that scepticism makes life impossible, viz—"Probability is the only rule of practical life". This is the doctrine of Probabilism. The difference, however, lies in this that while Arcesilaus doubts all knowledge, including even sense-perception the Chārvāka leaves margin for it

vain to attempt showing that from them the existence of a Omniscient Spirit could be inferred. And last but not least, Inference itself (अनुमान) is denied. The senses do not confessedly reach Him and verbal testimony falls under the category of inference. There is no means of ascertaining, therefore, that an all-knowing, all-powerful spirit exists. Nature (स्वभाव), and not God, is the watch-word of this school*.

(To be continued)

*The position of the Lokayatikas is thus summarised in the Vivarana Prameya Saṅgraha, p. 211, : भूत्युदयेष उत्त. प्रवचनेरह
क्षमात्, समाजाद एव वाचार्यः ।

IV GLEANINGS FROM THE HISTORY AND BIBLIOGRAPHY OF NYAYA VAISESIKA LITERATURE

BY GOPINATH KAVIRAJ

PREFATORY NOTE

The history of Nyaya Vaisesika Philosophy remains still to be written, and the time does not seem to be yet ripe for undertaking it present a work of this kind in as thorough a manner as might be desired. In the meantime a good deal of spade work will have to be done thus, it will be necessary to survey the whole field carefully and have an accurate and up to date knowledge of the resources available for this purpose.

Suhi, Faddegon Keith,—to name some among many—have rendered brilliant services to the cause of Nyaya Vaisesika Philosophy by their invaluable works. But as their had necessarily to rest on insufficient data none of these works can properly claim to be a history of philosophy presenting a consistent and exhaustive account of the development of thought in all its shades.

As regards bibliography Mr Chakravarti's paper on 'Nyaya Nyayi in Bengal' (in the J A S B) is excellent but its scope is narrow and it is a bit too scrappy. Dr Vidyākara's posthumous 'History of Indian Logic' is interesting but though apparently exhaustive it suffers from the same limitations, and I believe to a much greater extent and it seems that the book needs a careful revision especially, where it treats of the bibliography of the mediaeval and modern schools.

The following pages represent an humble, but further, contribution in the field made on the basis of the available

data in the hope of helping to prepare the ground for a systematic History of *Nyaya Vaisesika Philosophy*. These data consist among others in the study of (a) about 1500 Manuscripts in original on the subject belonging to the Library of the Government Sanskrit College Benares and to certain local private Collections and of (b) others as reported in the various Catalogues and Notices of MSS.

The History of *Nyaya Vaisesika Philosophy* is expected to follow soon. But its accomplishment and publication will naturally depend upon those of the bibliography herewith presented.

The Ancient Section of the work needs a separate and special treatment it has been therefore omitted from these pages and will appear in a forthcoming issue of the Studies.

GOPINATH KAVIRAJ

THE MEDIAEVAL PERIOD

In the following pages we shall start at once with the mediaeval period and proceed slowly with the course of time, reserving for a separate study the early history of the Literature of the systems and its bibliography.

It is assumed that the mediaeval age of the Nyāya-Vaisesika schools of thought opened with the eighth century, when the writings of Uddyotakarī and Prasastīpadī had already become things of the past. There is no doubt that the Hindu Nyāya Śastra suffered a temporary eclipse in these times under the overshadowing influence of Buddhist (and Jain) Sciences of Reasoning. It is probable that the Buddhist monasteries of Nalanda, Vikramasila, &c. had some share in bringing about this end. That individual scholars of extraordinary powers rose in defence of Buddhist Philosophy and set themselves to the task of demolishing whatever they found inconsistent with the accepted notions of their schools is beyond a shadow of doubt. And this they did more from a vindictive zeal than from any righteous or sensible motive. The name of Dharmakirti as one among many such polemic authors may be cited in this connection.

The curtain rises with the appearance on the scene of Bhāsarvajna, the author of Nyāyasara, in Kashmir and of Trīlochanī, the tutor of the great Vāchaspatī Misra, on the plains.

I BHĀSARVAJNA

As far as our present knowledge extends it may be said with justice that Bhāsarvajna's Nyāyasara stands unique in the history of the Mediaeval School of Nyāya philosophy in India. But the work has not been thoroughly examined yet, and I believe that a careful analysis of its contents will yield results of great historical interest. It would be foreign to

the purpose of these pages to enter into an examination of this kind, but some points may be noted in passing

A (a) In the first place I take up the question of the number of pramanas. Here Bhasarvajna is very emphatic in his assertion that (1) Pratyaksha (2) Anumana and (3) Agama are the *only* pramanas to be recognized (pp 30⁸, 34¹⁰ 11), the other alleged pramanas including upamana, already coming under the above. The rejection of upamana * to which the old School held fast with such tenacity is certainly characteristic, and is probably to be accounted for as the effect of the influence of Yoga Philosophy (cf Yo Sut 17)†, which might have acted upon it directly or through the Pratyabhijña philosophy.

(b) While setting forth the means to be adopted for realising Moksha Bhasarvajna prescribes नियायोग consisting of

* The Sarva Sādhanā Samgraha in its section on Nyāya (VI, 5, p 24⁹), observes चत्वायत्र प्रमाणानि नोपम वै तु कस्यचित्. This कस्यचित् I interpret as referring to Bhasarvajna whom we know as the earliest writer among the Nyāyikas admitting the threefold character of pramanas. This interpretation seems to be confirmed by the statement of the famous Kārikā in Śureśvarācharya's Mānasollasa, II 17 18 (Mysore Ed., pp 49 50), which also occurs in the Tarkikarakṣa (p 56), viz.,

प्रत्यक्षं रुचार्द्वाका काणारम्भाते पुरा ।
भनुदालं च तथाय स एष या गृह्णते चषिषि ॥
न्यायेनदारनाऽप्येवमुपनानं च कवन ।

where Mallinatha explains the word न्यायेनदेहिनः as भूषणादा, i.e. followers of the doctrines of भूषण or बामदङ्क for भूषण being a work of Bhasarvajna, see infra

† Though Sankhya too admits three pramanas (Sam Sut 199—201, Sam Kārikā 4), its influence on Bhasarvajna's work was nothing. The possible allegation of Vais influence if well founded would be more to the point. But it does not appear that Bhasarvajna had much sympathy with this school.

तप , स्थाध्याय and ईश्वरप्रणिधान This, he holds, is to serve as a helping practice for the sterilisation of *klesas*, and, through a graduated course of what are technically called Sadhanas viz यम, नियम and the other योगाङ्कs, for the attainment of Samadhi This is exactly the view expressed in १० Sut II 1

(c) It also appears that the classification of prameya* in Nyayasara (p 34), viz into हय, तन्त्रिकर्त्तक आत्मनितकदान and द्वानोपाय follows on the lines of the Yoga Sutras II 16 17, 25 26† (cf also Vijnanabhikṣu's Introduction to Sankhya Pravachana Bhasya) That Bhasarvajna had exactly these Sutras in his mind would follow as a plain corollary from a

* I fail to see any ground in Dr Vidyābhūṣana's statement (Int o to Nyayasara p 2) that Bhasarvajna 'treats only one topic, viz रसाय in his work for the whole of the latter portion of the book (pp. 341-419) is devoted to a consideration of the *prameyas*. It is immaterial that his formulation of the *prameyas* should differ from that of the older school.

† We need not suppose that this fourfold division of prameya in Nyayasara is based directly upon an analogy of the 4 *aryasaecas* of the Buddhists (cf Sanyutta Nikaya, V 420-2) But as to the further question whether some of the Yoga Sutras themselves, as we have them to-day, originated under Buddhist influence, it would be out of place to suggest any reply here. It is enough for the purpose in hand to concede that the Yoga Sutras in their present form and Vyasa's Commentary upon them are earlier than Bhasarvajna's day, and this I believe will be readily allowed. We may also remember that in Bhasarvajna's time or even before it, the doctrines and practices of Yoga had been widely in currency in Kashmir. That peculiar form of Kashmir Shaivism which goes by the name of Pratyabhijna Darśana had already been evolved as a compromise between the Theism of Yoga and the Advaita of Saṅkara, and in this Darśana therefore Yoga occupies a prominent position. Living in such a religious atmosphere, it was not strange that Bhasarvajna should have been deeply influenced in his doctrines by Yoga.

comparative study of Nyayasara p 34¹⁸ (हेय बुद्धमनागतम्)
and Yoga Sut II 16

(d) Bhasarvajna's definition of प्रत्यक्ष may be cited as a further example of how yoga deeply influenced his whole mental outlook. Perceiving that Gautama's प्रत्यक्षलक्षण (Ny Sut 114) does not apply to the transcendental visions of the Yogins* for which the contact of an object with the sense organs is not a necessary precondition and which with him had a profound reality he was constrained to alter the प्रत्यक्षलक्षण accordingly thus योगिप्रत्यक्ष देशकालस्वभावविप्रकृष्टार्थप्राहकम्।

B It may seem however that the introduction into a Nyaya work ideas and practices which we have been accustomed to associate with Yoga is of the nature of an accident. But as a matter of fact it has a historical significance which grows deeper in interest the more our acquaintance is widened with the course of ancient and mediaeval philosophy. For though Yoga in its wider form has been practically accepted by every system of Indian philosophy its relation with Nyaya is in some manner more special and perhaps fundamental. Here are for example some instances recorded in literature where the expression *Yoga* is employed invariably to indicate a professor of or pertaining to Nyaya.

(i) वैशेषिकनेयायिकयो ग्राय समानतत्त्वादौलूक्यमते क्षिप्ते
यैगमतमपि क्षिप्तेवादसेयम् ।

Syadvāda Munjari (Yaso Vijaya Jaina Series p 628)

* It is strange that whereas Nyaya Sutras do not recognise योगप्रत्यक्ष at all the Vaish Sutras dwell upon it at great length (cf Vaish Sut 9115). Neither Vatsayana nor Uddyotakara take note of it. The latter, on the other hand, definitely asserts सत्त्विक to be sixfold and is silent on what is known as असत्त्विक सत्त्विकै। It would seem that before the days of Tattvachintamani the difference between सत्त्विक and असत्त्विक सत्त्विक was not positively declared in a Nyaya treatise. Cf Raghunatha's Padartharatnamala, p 711-12

(ii) नैयायिकानां योगापराभिधानानां

Saddarśana Samuccaya Vṛtti, by Gunaratna, p 49.

(iii) ज्ञानान्तरप्रत्यक्षज्ञानवादिनां योगानां च मतमपाकर्तुम्

(That this is the view of the Naiyayikas is well known (cf their theory of *anuvyavasaya*) It is ascribed to them in the most unequivocal terms by Ananta Virya himself, at p 49 of the above gloss, thus,
ज्ञानान्तरप्रत्यक्षत्वादिति नैयायिका ।

(iv) प्रतिज्ञाद्वाहरणोपनयनिगमनसेदात् पञ्चावयवामिति योगाः ।

Ibid, p 44

(v) नापि सामान्यविशेषो परस्परानपेक्षौ इति योगमतमीपि, &c

Ibid, p 44

(vi) Cf Raja Sekhara's Saddarśana Samuccaya (Yaśo-Vijaya Jaini Series), pp 8 & 12 (verse 23)*

These evidences though coming from sources not recognised as orthodox, need not be summarily dismissed as calling for no attention [But cf Nyāya Varttika, Ben Ed, p 105, under Sutra 11 29 where the word 'Yauga' is employed in the sense of Naiyayika] Their cumulative weight is considerable Besides, the Sarva Siddhanta Sangraha of Śankara (pp 24¹¹, 28³, 10¹²) affords distinct proof in support of a relation existing between Nyaya and Yoga, for it is maintained there that according to Nyaya Mokṣa follows directly from Yoga, a doctrine which it shares in common with the Pātanjala system (as distinguished from the Sāṃkhya where

* Cf also नैयायिकसास्त्यवो कथाया भोक्तकानीद्रियाश्चिति पौगानामभोक्तकानोति सांस्कृतानामिति वाचिकं योगानां नैयायिकानां ।

(Nyāya Siddhantamāla of Jayarama, Ms of Bābu Dikṣita Jāṇe fol 16a, b)

jñāna is held to be the immediate cause of *Mukti**). The *Nyāya* *Darśana*, in its present form, contains some *Sutras* (4 2 38 49) where the practices of *Yoga* are strongly recommended.

C From the above it seems to be pretty clearly made out that the relation between *Nyāya* and *Yog* was an intimate one, and *Bhasarvajna* in laying stress upon certain *Yoga* practices in his treatise on *Nyāya* was not guilty of irrelevancy. His exposition was only a reflection—dim but faithful—of the then existing mediæval condition of this philosophy. But how, under what ascertainable influences, this fusion came about is a question to which no thoroughly convincing answer can be returned at present. Probably the right explanation will be found, *inter alia*, in the discovery of a bond of historical unity between these schools, and in my opinion this is supplied by the original *Śivagama* or its philosophical counterpart, the so called *Iṣvaravāda*, out of which not only the present form of *Yoga* and *Nyāya*, but the later *Sāṃkhya* philosophies also may have well arisen and gradually crystallised themselves into independent systems.

At any rate in *Nyāyasāra* *Sāṃkhya* influences are clearly discernible in many places. On p. 59 *Bhasarvajna* observes that two things are requisites as immediate antecedents for a direct vision of the Supreme Self (called here *Śiva*) and Final Release निरन्तरिष्यं श्रेयः to follow, viz परद्वयाम्य (known as अनाभृति) and परा भक्ति towards *Maheśvara*. This sloka is quoted

यदा चर्यवदाकाशं द्वैषिण्यन्ति मानवा ।

तदा शियमविद्धाय तु खस्यान्तो भविष्यति ॥

(श्वेताश्वतर उपनिषद् VI 20)

* See *Ibi* I, pp. 36 40 & 41 Cf *Sa Sut* 3 20—ज्ञाना मुक्ति । The *Yoga* view, as represented in *Sāṃkṣidhanta Saṅgraha*, is briefly thus :

पुरुषदिव्यरूपाणे ब्रह्मपिपासि पूर्व । इदं वदोपास्तु योगनव विनाशयत् ॥

It is, as we know, a stock verse among the Saivas (cf Sarva Darsana Sangraha, Saiva Darsana) The inculcation (23) of course, but it may be due in both cases to Saiva influence And similarly when we find in Nyāya Sāra, p. 35, the concept of Isvara expressed in language like 'ऐश्वर्यादिचित्तिष्ठ संसारधर्मरीपदप्यसंस्थृष्टे परो भगवान् महेश्वरः सर्वशस्त्रजगद्विधाता' it is hard to decide between Yoga and Saivism as its probable source The definition here given is taken almost *verbatim* from Yoga Sūtras 1 24 54, but then it is likely that these Sutras themselves were originally of Saiva formulation It may be remembered that the word ईश्वर or महेश्वर as found in Nyāya & Yoga was originally a name of Siva, as the corresponding word पुरुष (of Sankhya), or rather its derivative पुरुषोत्तम, came to mean Narayana * [We're not concerned here with the metaphysical contents of the terms ईश्वर and पुरुष or पुरुषोत्तम but only with their sectarian meanings] In this way then the philosophy of ईश्वरवाद is brought into close contiguity with the Saiva theology, and we can understand why Śaṅkara (Ved. Sct 2 2 37) should have arrayed in a line (under Isvaravādinī) such opponents as the

* This would be a confirmation of what Gunaratna actually says in his commentary on Hāmbhadrī's *Saṅkara Samuccaya* Rājasekhara (एकदर्शनसमूह, pp. 34,42-43) too mentions the fate that the Saṅkhyas were worshippers of Narayana (नारायणः) and the Yogins of Isvara or Siva (ईश्वरेश्वरः) In this connection the conception of Siva as the Yogi *par ex cellence* may also be remembered as implying that Yoga was theologically a Saiva system

+ This is not the right place to enter into a discussion of ईश्वरवाद and its relation to the other *Vaises* which arose in ancient India, in attempting to solve the problem of Efficiency (विभिन्नता) and the Origin of Motion In a general sense Nyāya too, while dealing with this question must come under the category of ईश्वरवाद The fact that Nyāya 4 1 20-21 are directed against ईश्वरवाद does not indicate, however, that this view is repudiated as altogether

vocates of Yoga, Nyaya, Vaisesika and other Saiva doctrines [It is to be remembered that the अधिकरण of ईश्वरघार is explained in Ratnprabha, Bhāmatī and Ānandagiri as bearing on मात्रेभवमत]*

It is historically interesting to note how the element of Bhakti has come to find a place in Bhāsarvajñā's work. The notion that Bhakti is the invariable antecedent of Jñāna is admittedly very old in India. Certainly the conception was familiar as an integral part of the theology of Nyaya (Vais) when the Sarvasiddhānta Sangraha was written, for its importance is recognised there—the doctrine of भक्ति (= Faith²), perhaps the word is here an equivalent of धर्मा and has not yet assumed the highly emotional colouring of the later age) and the parallel doctrine of Grace (प्रसाद) are accepted as essential in this twin system, so that Mokṣa or Realisation of the Self's Identity is held in both the Schools to ensue through Faith (भक्ति) and Divine Grace (प्रसाद), the mutual difference of the Schools being that while Nyaya adhered to Yoga as the direct antecedent of Mokṣa, Vaisesika kept away from it. The beginnings of this doctrine may be traced back to a remote past (perhaps even to the pre upaniśadic period), but its connection with Nyaya remains for investigation. I suppose that here, too, as elsewhere, unwarrantable, it means simply that the extreme form of this doctrine as illustrated in the so called पूज्यता दर्शन in Sarvadarsana Sangraha (e.g. निषेदकस्त्रिय of Iswara, meaning that the Agency of Iswara is free and spontaneous, and *not determined by* the Karmas of the Jivas) is incompatible with its general background. Cf Tat Tika, p. 418, lines 13-14

◦ Rāja Śekhara & Cūḍaratna take

शेव=नैयायिक (called तपावी इ द्याट्वाद्यक्तो)

& पात्रुपद=वैशिष्ठिक ।

These are two out of the 4 Mahesvara sects. Ratnprabha and Ānandagiri differ from this view.

the influence of Saivism is palpable. [Bhāsarvajñā notes the भूक्ति element alone, but we may be sure that he had nothing to say against the corresponding element of Grace too, which occurs in the Svetāśvatara Upaniṣad, a high authority with Bhāsarvajñā, as with all Saiva philosophers.]

D. Another point to which attention may be briefly drawn in a study of Nyāyasāra is the recognition of a distinction between Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika in their earlier (but post-Vātsyāyaniya) forms in the conception of Mokṣa. The former held that Mokṣa consists in the attainment of the essentially blissful character of the Self, involving of course cessation of all Pain (which embraces, among other things, the sensible pleasure too), but the latter, unable to conceive of any higher pleasure than what passes for it in the world, were reluctant to admit that in Mokṣa happiness persists. Their view of Mokṣa was thus negative, as consisting in the absence of all the *vिशेषगुण*s of the Self, including with other qualities तुःख as well as सुख & शान्. Bhāsarvajñā notes this distinction (pp 39-41)* and taking side with the Naīyāyika (p 417-8), thus concludes “अनेन (i.e. नित्येन) सुखन विशिष्टा आत्मनिकी तुःखनिवृत्तिः पुरुषस्य मोक्षः” (cf. Gunaratna's report of this view, pp. 93-94).† That such a distinction did really exist between the two systems during a certain period would be evidenced by the two definitions of मुक्ति in Sarvasiddhānta Saṅgraha :

(i) Under “Vaiśeṣika pakṣa” we have (V. 35-36)—

तद (परमेश्वर) प्रसादेन मोक्षः स्यात् करणोपरमात्मकः ।

* The Commentators Bhatṭa Raghava (Ben Sk Coll Ms 162, fol 98a4) and Jaya Simha Sūri (pp 282, 284) plainly ascribe the two views as expounded in Nyāyasāra to Vaiśeṣika and Nyāya.

† This view, which latterly came to be associated with Nyāya, had been recognised as a पूर्वपक्ष in Vātsyāyana's Comn entary on Ny. Sūt. 1.1.22.

करणोपरमे त्वामा पापाणायदवस्थितः ।
दुष्टसाध्यसुयोच्छेदो दुष्टोच्छेदयदेव न ।

(ii) Under 'Naijāyika pakṣa' (VI 41-43)—

नित्यानन्दानुभूतिः स्यान्माक्षेत्रं तु विषयादते ।
वरं बृहदाधेन रम्ये शूगालत्तं वृणोम्यहम् ।
वैशेषिकोक्तमोक्तात् सुखेष्विवर्जितात् ॥*

Whether this Ananda element found admission into Nyāya directly through Vedānta or through its Kashmirian representative—the Pratyabhijñā 'chool of thought'—cannot be ascertained. But the authorities quoted (cf. Vidyabhusāya's Ed., p. 40¹⁰⁻¹³) by Bhāsarvajna are worthy of note.

I think the above will suffice to bring out the historical importance of this neglected tractise, and serve as a plea for its wider appreciation.

* * * * *

It was not known whether Bhāsarvajna had written any other work, besides the one under notice. Neither Vidyabhusāya nor Suli seems to have anything to say in this regard. But Bhatta Raghava, whose *ṭīka* on Nyāya is it may be pronounced to be the oldest extant Commentary on the book supplies positive proof to show that Bhāsarvajna had written a gloss called *Bhūṣṇa* on his own work. I do not entertain any doubt as to the identity of this *Bhūṣṇa* with the Nyāya *bhūṣṇa* mentioned by Gunaratna (p. 94⁶) and Rajasekhara.

* The sloka occurs in a slightly variant form in the following Ślok. —

दृष्टबृहदाधेन रम्ये शूगालत्तं वृणोम्यहम् ।
न वै वैशेषिकी मुक्ति शायामि कदाचन ॥'

The expression 'न वै वैशेषिकी मुक्ति' is significant. Over against this above stands, however, the statement in the Naisadha (17.75)—मुक्ते ए निकालाय यागमूर्त्ति &c which may be explained as either due to confusion (common in the later period) or as referring to the original system instead of its medieval modification.

? 10⁷) as the oldest of the 18 commentaries on Nyayasara and it is this to which Jaya Singh Suri in his Commentary on Nyayasara so often refers * Here is what Bhāṭṭa Raghava says (I quote from Ms 162 of the Government Sanskrit library, Benares) यत्तु स्मरणान्ति पाठान्तरं (cf Vidyābhūṣaṇa Ed of Nyayasara Text p 2⁹-1⁰) तिष्ठति तत् ग्रहिण्डतमन्यपाठकदोपादित्युपेद्यम् । भूषणे च भासर्वज्ञैरक्षानस्य गगादरिति व्याकुर्वद्विरीदश पव पाठ क्षण्ठतोऽपि प्रतिष्ठित ।

Fol 116⁴⁻⁵

In Nyayasara the reading generally met with is this —स्मरण-हानवयवद्वेदार्थमनुभवग्रहणम्, i.e. the word अनुभव in the definition of pramāṇa (viz सम्यग्नुभृत्साधनं प्रमाणम्) is employed to guard against the possible inclusion of स्मरण and हान. Bhāṭṭa Raghava criticises the above as pedantic, and on his own part approves the reading स्मरण and अह्वान. The ground of his preference, he adds is that Bhāsarvajña himself has established that reading (अह्वान) with the stamp of his sanction in commenting on the word in भूषण.

In continuation of the evidence of Bhāṭṭa Raghava we may point out that in Nyaya Lilavati Vallabhacharya also refers to Bhāsarvajña as the author of Bhāsara. Thus—

तदिदं चिरन्तनचैषेषिकमतद्वूपण भूषणकारस्यातित्रपाकरम् ।
तदियमताच्छातता भासर्वज्ञस्य यदयमाचार्यमन्यतो ।

(Nyaya Lilavati Sir Ed p 3.)

The question here relates itself to the existence of सख्या as an independent guna. The author of Bhāsara denies it as unnecessary, and thus breaks loose from the traditional ideas of the school (cf Vaiś Sut 116 and Praśastapada, p 111). Hence the above remark †

* Cf Vidyabhasana Ed वायतात्पदोपिका pp 56 64 65 67 80 87

† In commenting on Nyayasara (Vidyabhusaṇa Ed, p 3²-3) Bhāṭṭa Raghava makes the following observations, showing that according to Bhāsarvajña मरा & पूरुषस् as separate gunas have

Again, Chitsukha quotes in his *Tattvapradipikā* (N. Sag. Ed., 1915, p. 224), under the name of Bhāsarvajīra (भूपणकारभाषितं) the definition of Viparyaya as भिद्यारथयसापो विपर्ययः ।

A glance at *Nyāyasāra* (*Vidyābhūṣaṇa's* Ed., p. 2⁸) would show that this is Bhāsarvajīra's own definition. [Observe that here also Bhāsarvajīra leans towards Yoga. Cf. Yo. Sot 1.8]

Ptatyaksavarupa, in his commentary on Chitsukha's *Tattvapradipikā*, quotes the definitions of *Samsaya* and *Pratyaksha* as given by the author of *Nyāyabhoṣaṇa* in these terms : (1) तथाच 'अनवधारणहानं संशयः' इति वदतो न्यायभूपणकारस्य वदनस्रोरुद्धं व्याहृतिद्विमाद्वतम् (p. 222) & (2) 'सम्यगपरोत्त्वात् तु भवत्साधनं प्रत्यक्षम्' (p. 230). These definitions occur in the *Nyāyasāra*. In the same manner Mallīṣena also quotes (in the *Siddhādamāñjari*, p. 65, *Yasovijaya Jain Series*) Bhāsarvajīra's definition of *Pravṛddha* as that of the author of *Nyāyabhoṣaṇa* Sūtra. These are further arguments in favour of the proposed identity of the authors of *Nyāyasāra* and Bhūṣaṇa.

The full title of Bhāsarvajīra's Commentary was as already stated *Nyāyabhoṣaṇa*, which for convenience of reference came to be shortened into mere Bhūṣaṇa. While expatiating on the famous passage in *Kirājavallī*—तस्माद् घरं भूपणः कर्मापि गुणस्तद्वच्छायोगात् (Vindhyesvarī Prasād's Ed., p. 160)—Vādīndra mentions the fuller name of the book. Thus, no existence, but that in the manner of प्रमेयत्वं they reside in all the padārthas alike :

अत्र सद्गमद्य परमते इष्टध्यम् । खमते तु संख्यापृष्ठहृष्टदेः सकलपरायानेष्टसेन सामाध्यवकाशावात् । यथा हि प्रमेयत्वस्यवहाराद् सकलपरायेषु प्रमेयत्वं वया संख्यापृष्ठहृष्ट तवोः सप्तरात्मेषु पृष्ठकृष्टकृष्टापवामित्वा तु चिद्धार्किकार्णं मृप्या भवेत् ।

Fol. 14a³⁻⁵

(Cf. *Nyāya Līlāvallī*. The author of *Upaskīra* (7.2 1) thus puts the view of Bhūṣaṇa on संख्या—इकूपाप्तिद् एकत्वं, एव रूपमेदरु दिवादिकम् । Cf. also Guṇa *Kirājavallī*, p. 192).

in his Rasasara we read- कर्म गुण सामान्यवत्त्वे स्पर्शनाधारत्वे
च सति द्रव्याश्रितत्वात् । सामान्यवत्त्वे सति कार्यनाधारत्वा-
दित्यनुमानाभ्युच कर्म गुण इति न्यायभूपणाकारः । *

Mr Haraprisada Sāstri, in his Preface to "Six Buddhist Nyaya Tracts", p 11, distinguishes the न्यायभूपण known as the Commentary on Nyayasāra from the Bhuṣaṇa referred to in the pages of the Tarkikarakṣā (pp 341, 351 & 353). The latter, he observes, is "a Vṛtti on the Nyaya Sutras" [Cf also f note 1 in Kīrapāvalī (guṇa), pp 160, 192] Sualī, in a note at p 59 of his work, seems also inclined to accept this view. But nowhere are the grounds clearly stated. Possibly it is supposed that as all the three references to Bhuṣaṇakāra in the Tarkikarakṣā, bear on निप्रदस्थान—a subject to which the Nyaya Sutras have devoted a lengthy discussion, the Bhuṣaṇa must be a gloss on these Sutras. But I fear this supposition is vitiated by what I might call the fault of 'undue extension' (गौरव) It is more likely that passages quoted in Tarkikarakṣā have been taken from the section dealing with the varieties of निप्रदस्थान in Bhāsarvajña's Commentary on Nyayasāra (cf also Tarkikarakṣā, p 351¹⁰⁻¹¹ & Nyayasāra p 26¹⁸⁻¹⁷) As to whether the statements attributed to Nyayabhuṣaṇa by Ratnakīrti (Six Bud Ny Tracts, pp 11, 58) are really those of Bhāsarvajña himself in Bhuṣaṇa or of a distinct author of that name, I cannot presume to judge.

* Rasasara, p 4, edited by Gopinath Kaviraj (Benares Sarasvatī Bhavana Texts No 5) But on p 7, in defending the orthodox view as to the independent character of कर्म as a category, the author of Rasasara himself refers to the shortened form of the name एवेन कर्माणि गुण इति भूपणोऽपि प्रायुक्तः । सामान्यवत्त्वे । सति उद्यान-
विभागत फलवदस्थायाप्यज्ञोहस्तीक्ष्मिसुप्रव्यवहारय वा कर्मणि प्रायादनुमानसइस्थापि
माधायनुमयत्वात् ।

II TĀTPARYĀCHĀRYA

The name of this author seems to have well nigh disappeared from the subsequent history of the literature. But it would appear from reference, by earlier writers that he had been a man of considerable influence. Udayana quotes his view on Pramaṇyavāda in his Atmatattva Viveka* (Jayanāya Tarkapāñchāna's Ed p 65²⁰) and though it is set aside there as being irreconcilable with the system of traditional Nyaya (न्यायसम्प्रदाय) to which he himself belonged, the mere fact of its being quoted by an eminent scholar like himself would constitute a claim for its propounder to a wider recognition.

Mm Vindhyan Prasad Dube (Intros to Prasasta pada Bhāṣya with Kāraṇavālī p 28) and the late Mm Chandra Kanta Tarkalankara (Intro to his own Commentary on Kusumāñjali Haricas, p 11) identified this Tatparyacharya with Vachaspati Miśra, the author of Tatparyāṭīka but this will have to be given up now in view of the decisive statement of Vallabhācharya in the Nyāyalavatī

तदियमनास्तात्ता भासर्वज्ञस्य यदयमाचार्यमध्यवसन्यते ।
तथा च तदनुयायिनश्चापर्याचार्यस्य सिद्धनादं ‘सविदेव हि
भगवती’त्यादि ।

(Nir Sagara Ed p 33 10 12)

From this passage it is evident that Tatparyacharya was a follower (possibly a direct successor or even Commentator) of Bhasarvajna and that his attitude towards the orthodox school like that of his own Guru was often not quite a

° एकोटिनिष्ठो हनुभवो निश्चय । ज्ञाततद्भगवाहिणि च ज्ञाने न
द्वृतमिति ० यत्क्षिप्तिरेततद्याम प्रामाण्यनिवाय परत परेति ० न्यायसम्प्रदाय । अत परति
विषयात् वादग्रस्य सत्त परति तत्परत्वं ।

† For another reference to Tatparyacharya see Vachaspati II, Khāḍyānoddhara, p 81

pliant one. The dictum ascribed to him in Nyayalilāvati is quoted in full by Śankara Miśra in Upaskara (7 2 26), by Jayarāma in Nyāya Siddhantamala (fol. 120 a¹)* and by Vāchaspati II in Khandīnoddhārī (Ben Ed., p 103), where it stands thus

‘ संविदेव हि भगवती वस्तृपगमे नः शरणम् । † ’

It is an appeal to Intuition or Immediate Perception as against the formal testimony of Authority for the ascertainment of the real character of an object (वस्तृपगम) ‡ This would

* Ms of Babu Dikshita Jade of Benares

† It is quoted in Pañmala, a com. on महायमेज्ञी (V. 32) by Mahesvarananda, thus संविदेव भगवती विषयस्त्वोऽप्यम् शरणम्, etc. (p 80, Trivand Ed.)

‡ In Nyayalilāvati, for example, the question arises as to whether उद्या as an independent guaś is to be admitted. The Sutrakara and Prasastapada both wouch for its separate existence, but Bhāskaravajsa and with him Tatparyacharya, emphatically deny it, setting at naught the weight of all tradition, apparently on the simple but ultimate ground of सावद वोद्य. It is interesting to note that *Sūtra*, or as it is somewhere in a more restricted sense denominated ‘pratīti’, as the final arbiter for all decisions, is practically admitted by all [Cf. Śankara Miśra’s remarks in Upaskara on the Samavaya Sūtra (cf. also Jayanta, p 312). Precisely the same attitude of mind is evinced by the opponent in Nyayamanjari when he defies the authority of Prasastapada on the strength of what he calls ‘प्रतीति’ (Nyayamanjari, pp 136²⁴, 137²). Thus, referring to the statement of Prasastapada (Viz. Ed., p 24), viz. वयाण प्रचन्दवस्तुप्रचन्दवत् ति, the opponent, anxious to establish the pratyakṣyatva of Kala declaims “ नेदं देविक वचन यश्चनिकल्पायत् । त च वचनं प्रचन्दवस्तुप्रचन्दवत् च ॥५३॥ याप्तं । प्रसन्नत्वं हि पैदिकक्षत विविषयत्वम् यते । त च देवित कालस्य नारूपस्थापि प्रचन्दता केन वर्यते ।

Viz Ed., pp 136²⁷-137³.

Viewed from our present standpoint the drift of the opponents

seem to correspond, in one of its aspects, to the Pratibhā of the Yoga system (Yo Sut. 3. 54) described as immediate and all embracing, as distinguished from अनुमान and आगम which are remote [cf "सर्ववस्तुनि संविदेकहरणानि &c" in Pramāna Pārāyaṇa by Śālikanātha, Upamāna Chap. (Pandit, Old Series, Vol. I, p. 153). संविद्, comprising अनुभूति (= प्रमा, there being no false presentation according to Prabhākaras) and स्मृति (संस्कारमात्रजा संविद्) is a favourite word with the Prabhākaras.] The epithet भगवती as applied to संविद् is strangely reminiscent of Kashmir Saivism or Pratyabhijñā Darsana, where the expression भगवती संविद् or its equivalents are of frequent occurrence* (Javasinha Suri speaks of प्रत्यभिज्ञा as भगवती in his Commentary on Nyaya Sāra, Vidy. Ed., p 266).

argument would appear to be this That आप्तवत् is acceptable in so far as it does not clash with our experience, but as soon as it happens to differ its validity is impugned (cf the view हर्षार्थे वेदाचाप्रमात्रय नाहित). Of course in a sphere beyond human experience its validity stands undisputed A curious doctrine this and is open to grave objections But such seems to have been the position of the opponent here concerned.

* Cf Kēmaraja—

A. In Pratyabhijña hrdaya (Kashmir Series, Vol III),

(a) सर्वं न्तरमत्वेन वर्तमानत्वात् तद्भित्तिभूतं इत्या च वस्त्रोष्ट्रपि
स्वरूपानुपर्यः सविदेव भगवता “मध्यम्”।

P. 37¹³⁻¹⁵

(b) यदा तु उक्तुक्तिक्षेप सर्वं न्तरमत्वे मध्यमूता सविद्यमात्री विकमति etc

P. 39¹²

(c) परापीतस्या चिरिदेव भगवती स्वरूपा etc

P. 2⁶⁻⁷

(Note the use of the term चिरिदात्र in Yoga)

(d) विदेव भगवता स्वरूपतात्त्वा

and B In Commentary on the Śiva Sutras, called Vimuktini

(Kashmir Series, Vol I)

(a) यदा द्वारेका सर्वद इत्यायोक्तमुत्तम शूलमेत्यन्त विद्य वसन्तो

It is probable therefore that Tātparyacharya was a native of Kashmir

III — TRILOCHANA

Ratna Kirti (950 ?)* in his Apoha Siddhi ("Six Bud Nj Tracts, p 13) and Kṣanabhangasiddhi (ibid, pp 58,70) quotes to refute the views of one Trilochana. No definite data are available to determine the identity of this author, except what appears from a study of the meaning of the

It may be mentioned by the way that the Sloka

सविद् भगवती देवा स्मृत्यनुभवेदिका ।
स्तुति सूत्रेन्या स्मृति सरकारमात्रजा ॥

ascribed by Gaurikanta to the text of Tarkabhāṣa in some recensions has a like significance. The characterisation of सविद् by the epithets भगवती and देवा is notable. Moreover, its description as the Supreme Witness (for such would be the meaning of स्मृत्यनुभवेदिका, i.e. the witness of स्मृत्य and स्तुति or of the whole mental life) rather than as a mere state of consciousness while bringing it close to the Vedāntic conception of सात्त्वी, is a sure mark of its relation to the Trika philosophy of Kashmir.

*Dr. Vidyabhāṣa (Med Ind Logic, p 140, footnote 2) makes the older Ratnakīrti, a contemporary of Raja Vimala Chandra (650 A.D.)—the author of Apohasiddhi and Kṣanabhangasiddhi. But the internal evidence of the works does not justify this view. How, for example, could a man of the 7th Century have quoted from an author (e.g. Vachaspati) who lived undoubtedly so late as 841 A.D. at the earliest? To avoid falling into this absurdity I prefer to take the author of Apohasiddhi &c to be the younger Ratna Kirti whom Dr. Satis Chandra himself describes as the guru of Ratnakara Śānti (ibid, p.140) in the University of Vikramashila. Ratnakara's time being 983 A.D. I have placed Ratnakīrti in the middle of the 10th Century. [N.B. This is an indirect corroboration of the plea for an earlier date (than 976 A.D.) for Vachaspati Mātra]

extracts given by Kāṇī Kīrtī, viz that he had been an established Nyāya writer before the 10th Century Mr H P Sastri (Preface to Six Bud Ny Tracts, p ii) identifies him with the teacher (विद्यागुरु) of the great Vāchaspatti Miśra* and it is likely that he is right

IV—VĀCHASPATI MIŚRA

The greatest name in the history of Philosophy of this country is perhaps that of Trīlochanā's pupil Vāchaspatti Miśra. His wide and deep erudition in all the branches of Indian Thought earned for him the rare distinction of being called सर्वत्रस्वतन्त्र (Master of all Sciences)—a distinction seldom grudged by his successors. It is difficult to glean anything from his numerous works in which traces of his personal predilections in any direction might be detected. His all round scholarship and sympathy with diverse ways of thinking makes such an attempt almost impossible.

While the Vedāntists claim him as their own saying that he had been in his previous existence the great Vārttika kāra Suresvara himself one of the direct disciples of Sankarācharya Udayana pays homage to him rather as a great authority in Nyāya and comments on his work. So with Mīmāṃsa, Saṃkhya and Yoga—everywhere the stamp of his genius is unmistakeable.

Similarly it might appear that Vāchaspatti was a Śaiva in faith. His obeisance to Bhava (Intro to Bhāmat, Verse 3 and to Nyāya Kanikā Verse 2) to Piṇḍikā (Tat Tīkā Intro Verse 1) and to Viṣaketu (Intro to Tattvavaiśāradī, Verse 1 Cf Tatparyā Tīkā p 513¹² 13), might be cited as an illustration of his belief. But his devotion to

* Both Udayana and Vardhamana speak of Trīlochanā as Vāchaspatti's Guru. And Vāchaspatti himself says in the Tatparyā tīkā
विशेषत्वत्तु तत्परां नुगमना दुष्टे ।
पृथग्मात् पृथग्मत् शारथात्तिरक्षादृशम् ॥

Vishnu* and to Ganesa is equally patent (See Intro. Verse 1 in Nyaya Kanikā and Verse 4 in the beginning of Bhāmatī).

It appears from a reference to Udayanāchārya's Tātparyaparisuddhi that Vāchaspati's tutor was Trlochanat. But in the Introduction of Nyāya Kanikā, Verse 3, Vāchaspati thus says,

अङ्गानतिमिरशमन्तो परदमन्तो न्यायमञ्चर्ता रुचिराम ।
प्रसवित्रे प्रभवित्रे विद्यातरवे नमो गुरवे ॥

Are we to understand this passage as containing an implied allusion to his Guru's work, Nyaya Mañjari?

Hall's remark (Bibliography, pp 5, 9, 21, cf Auf's Cat. Cat I, p 560, Ind Off. Cat, p 719) that मार्त्तेऽटतिलकस्वामी was the name of Vāchaspati's tutor was obviously due to a misinterpretation of the 4th Verse of the Introduction of the Bhāmatī, viz

मार्त्तेऽटतिलकस्वामीमहागणपतीन् वयम् ।
विश्वधन्यान् नमस्याम सर्वसिद्धिधिधायिन ॥

Here Martanda, Tilakasvami and Mahāgaṇapati are the names of three distinct gods. The belief that their worship ensures success is a very old one and is recorded in Smṛti literature (Cf Yājñā Sm 1 293, see also Bāla Śāstri's Ed. Bhāmatī, p 1, f note 3) Martand is doubtless the Sun and Mahāgaṇapati the once famous god of that name (Ānandagirī in his Sankaravijaya testifies to the existence in the days of Sankarācharya of a sect of Gaṇapatyas worshipping महागणपति as the Supreme Self See Chap XV, Bibl Ind.

*It is striking that though the descriptions of the Deity in the first benedictory verse of Nyayakanikā approaches to the definition of Īswara in Yoga Sutra it is as Visnu and not as īswara or Śiva that the Deity is conceived.

†See also Mm. H P Sastri, Preface to "Six Bud Ny. Tracts" p. ii.

Ed, pp 106-110 For a description of Mahagāspati see Gopinath Rao's "Hindu Iconography", Vol I, Part I, pp 55-6)

From the two concluding verses (5 & 6) of the Bhāmatī it would appear that Vāchaspati undertook to compose this his greatest work during the reign, and perhaps at the request, of one Raja Nṛga. And it is just probable, considering the praises lavished upon this king, that he had been Vāchaspati's own patron. But who was he? That he was not a mythical figure may be almost taken for granted. According to Vāchaspati he was a king of a generous nature, accomplished in the Sastras and highly famed for his wonderful deeds. And it is further said that the deeds which he had performed with such remarkable ease (लोकामात्रयिनिर्मित) were, not merely beyond the actual power of other kings who would seek to imitate him, but even above their comprehension (मनसापि दुष्कराणि). I have found a passage in the Bhāmatī which would seem to set in full light the meaning of the above. The kirtis already

nibandha he himself assigns 898 (घस्वद्गुणवस्तु) as the date of its composition, and though the era to which the number refers is left unmentioned it is likely that we have to take it standing for Vikrama Samvat, and not for Śakābda. The year would then correspond to 841 A.D.*

Regarding the native place of Vāchaspati tradition and opinion of scholars are equally divided. From the evidence of a sloka found in the Introduction of Nyāya Sutroddhārat Mm H.P. Śāstri infers that he was an inhabitant of Mithilā. But this can hardly be accepted as a correct view. The author of Nyāya Sutroddhāra was Vāchaspati II and was not identical with the author of Bhīmati and other works.

Vāchaspati was a voluminous writer, mostly of commentaries. In Nyāya‡ two works have come down to us, of which

Ed, pp. 106-110. For a description of Mahīgāṇapati see Gopinath Rao's "Hindu Iconography", Vol I, Part I, pp. 55-6).

From the two concluding verses (5 & 6) of the Bhāmatī it would appear that Vāchaspati undertook to compose this his greatest work during the reign, and perhaps at the request, of one Rāja Nrga. And it is just probable, considering the praises lavished upon this king, that he had been Vāchaspati's own patron. But who was he? That he was not a mythical figure may be almost taken for granted. According to Vāchaspati he was a king of a generous nature, accomplished in the Sāstras and highly famed for his wonderful deeds. And it is further said that the deeds which he had performed with such remarkable ease (लीलामात्रविनिर्मित) were, not merely beyond the actual power of other kings who would seek to imitate him, but even above their comprehension (मनसापि दुर्घटराणि). I have found a passage in the Bhāmatī which would seem to set in a clearer light the meaning of the above. The kirtis already named are here specified as magnificent palaces and pleasure gardens. It occurs under Ved Sut 2133 and may be quoted here in full न चाद्यापि न हृष्यन्ते लीलामात्रविनिर्मितानि महाप्रासादप्रमदवतानि श्रीमन्नृगनरेन्द्राणामन्येषां मनसापि दुर्घट-राणि नरश्वराणाम्। (Nir Sagar Ed., p 406)

There cannot be much uncertainty as to the age in which Vachaspati Misra flourished. For in his Nyāyasuchi-

- * नृपान्तराणा मनसाध्यम्या भ्रष्टेपमत्रेण चकार कीर्तिम् ।
कात्तचरासारसुपूरितार्यसार्य स्थय शास्त्रविचक्षणं च ॥
नेत्रया यज्ञविरागनुकारमित्यन्वित कर्तुं न च पारयेति ।
तदिमनु महापे महीयकीर्तीं श्रीमन्त्यगोडकारि मथा निष्ठत्वं ॥

[†]Cf Amalānanda in *Vedanta Kalpataru* (Viz. Ed., p. 246). आचार्य
या महोपरिमहाचकार (Appaya dīksita in the *Kalptaruparamala* prefers
the reading महयाचकार। See *Pannala*, Viz. Ed., p. 406) तदै नाम सूग
इति ।

nibandha he himself assigns 898 (८९८) as the date of its composition, and though the era to which the number refers is left unmentioned it is likely that we have to take it standing for Vikrama Samvat, and not for Śakabda. The year would then correspond to 841 A.D.*

Regarding the native place of Vāchaspati tradition and opinion of scholars are equally divided. From the evidence of a sloka found in the Introduction of Nyāya Sutroddhāra† Mm H P. Śāstri infers that he was an inhabitant of Mithilā. But this can hardly be accepted as a correct view. The author of Nyāya Sutroddhāra was Vāchaspati II and was not identical with the author of Bhamati and other works.

Vāchaspati was a voluminous writer, mostly of commentaries. In Nyāya two works have come down to us, of which

* Cf (i) Sulari, Introduzione allo studio Filosofia Indiana, p 58, (ii) Woods, Yoga system of Patanjali (H O. Series, Vol 17), Introduction, pp XXI-XXIII, (iii) Seal, The Positive Sciences of the Ancient Hindus p 51 : (iv) Chakravarti, J A S B , 1915, pp 263,400 As opposed to the above I may set the view of Mm. H.P. Śāstri (Preface to Śāstri's Notices, Vol II, p. XII & "An Examination of the Nyāya Sutras" in J A S B , 1905, p 246) who is disposed to maintain the Baka theory. With all respect for the Śāstriji's erudition in this field I beg to differ from him on this point, for the simple reason that Vāchaspati ought to be placed at a sufficiently long interval from Udayana (984 A.D.) to enable the latter to conceive of the idea of writing a Commentary upon his work.

† Śāstri's Notices, Vol II, No 118, p 98 (cf Preface XII).

‡ Vāchaspati has left his speculations almost on every orthodox school. I say almost, because no work has yet been found dealing exclusively with the Vaishnava system in its alienated form. But though not discovered, such a work may be still existing. In Saṅkhya his Tattva Kaumudi has become a standard treatise, and

one is a mere booklet attempting to fix the number of Gotama's Sutras and their readings It is known as Nyaya

Nyaya Kankika, a Commentary on Maydana Misra's Vidhiviveka, is as good a tract in Mimamsa as the Bharmati is uncontestedly in Vedanta It is not a work on Nyaya, but on Mimamsa, and it is a pity that a scholar like the late Mr Dr. Satis Chandra Vidyabhusana in his posthumous work on 'The History of Indian Logic (p 314) makes the curiously blundering statement 'Vachaspati Misra's Nyaya Kankika, a work on logic is not now available' The work was published in Benares as early as the year 1907 A D and is even now available in print The word Nyaya seems to have led Dr Vidyabhusana to the belief that it was 'a work on logic', though it is well known that many celebrated Mimamsa works have a similar designation Cf. Madhavacharya's Nyaya ratna stava, Parthasarathi Misra's Nyaya ratna, Nyaya ratna mal, etc Tattvabindu is a small original paper devoted to discussion of Sound Tattva Samiksa (Bharmati, Nir Sagar Ed., p 996, Tat Tika, p 57) or Brahmatattva Samiksa (Bharmati, Nir Sagar pp 15, 466 & Tatparya Tika, p 394) and Brahma Siddhi (Nyaya Kankika p 80) are two other Vedantic works, now lost, by Vachaspati, to which he himself makes passing references [Hall, p 87, and Amalanda (in Vedanta Kalpataru, Viz Ed., p 558) make Tattva Samiksa a Commentary on the Brahma Siddhi] Of all his works Brahma Siddhi, Brahmatattva Samiksa & Nyaya Kankika (mentioned in Bharmati, p 15, 406, 996, in Tatparya Tika, pp 394 395, 467, in Tattva Vaisaradi under Sat 4 14) seem to be the earliest, and Tattvabindu mentioned in Bharmati, p 996, Tattva Vaisaradi and Bharmati the latest. Tatparya tika is earlier than Tattvakauvudi (cf Kaumudi under Kankika 5), but later than the earliest group From the expression 'तत्त्वाद्यत्पादयगाना उदाकाशं निरुप्ते' in the Bharmati (concluding verse 2) it appears that

Sauchimbandha. The other is a commentary on Uddyotakara's Nyāya Vārtika known as Nyāya Vārtika Tātparya Tīkā. He is said (Bühler's Catalogue of Sk. MSS. in the Private Libraries of Gujarat etc. 4, p. 24) to have also written a Commentary on Nyāyatratna, apparently an older treatise which is now lost.*

The Nyāyatattvāloka, noticed in the India Office Catalogue, pp. 610-611, was the work of the younger Vāchaspati Miśra, and not of the author of the Tātparya tīkā.

V.—JAYANTA

The determination of the time of Jayanta, the author of Nyāyamañjari does not seem to be beset with much difficulty.

Gaṅgeśa's reference to him as जरन्नेयाधिक shows that in the latter's time he had been an established authority.

There does not seem to exist any positive evidence in confirmation of the alleged quotation by Jayanta from Vāchaspati Miśra's works.

(a) Mr. Chakravarti's statement (J.A.S.B., Sept. 1915, p.262, f. Note I) that "Bhāmati is quoted as an authority in Nyāya Mañjari" is apparently founded on the foot note by Mm. Pandit Gaṅgādhara Sāstri (Ny. Mañj., p.120) where the Joka—

* May it not be the same Nyāyatratna which Bhāsatrayāja in Nyāyasara attributes to the authorship of his own Guru ?

Presumably the work had been of great merit and enjoyed a wide celebrity before the time of Vāchaspati Miśra, or he would not have undertaken to write out a Commentary upon it. And this would be perfectly in keeping with the encomiums bestowed upon it by Bhāsatrayāja.

यत्नेनानुभितोऽप्यर्थं कुण्डलैरनुमारुभि ।
अभियुक्ततरैरन्यैरन्यथैवोपपद्यते ॥

is erroneously ascribed to Bhāmatī under Sutra 2111. The sloka as a matter of fact does not belong to Bhāmatī, where it is introduced is तदुक्तम्. It occurs originally in Bhartr̄ihari's Vakyapadiya, I 34.

(b) Gangādhara (Preface to Ny. Mañj., p 1) says that in the sentence तदपि परिहृतमाचार्येऽर्जातं च संवद्धं च इत्येक काल इति वदद्विष्टि. (Ny. Mañj., p 312¹²) the word आचार्येऽर्जा is to be understood as a reference to Vāchaspati Miśra whose Tatparyā Tīkā on Sutra 2132 contains the following statement. अथासम्बद्धस्य विद्यमातत्वं तत्र सत्यपि पृथग्गतिमर्थे नाव्यविनोदस्ति जात. सम्बद्धश्चेत्येकः कालः (p 267). Now, though the dictum जात &c found in Ny. Mañj. does really occur in Tatparyatikā it may not have been the original pronouncement of Vāchaspati. For in view of the practically insignificant interval between their periods of life* it is hard to believe that Jayanta should have spoken of Vāchaspati in such term as आचार्येऽर्जा at all. It is more probable that the dictum had been even then, as later (cf Upaskara on 123), a familiar one, and that the आचार्येऽर्जा referred to by Jayanta, may have been an ancient authority.

As for the personal history of Jayanta nothing more is known than what his son Abhinanda has recorded in the Introduction of his Kādambanī Kathasara. It is said there that Jayanta's 5th ancestor, named Śakti, had emigrated from Gauḍa and settled in Darvābhīṣara, a country which Dr Buhler located on the frontiers of Kashmir (Ind. Ant., Vol

* Vāchaspati lived in 841 A.D. and Jayanta, being the great grandson of Śakti Svami the minister of king Muktapida Lalitaditya of Kashmir could not have been far removed from him in age. Possibly both were contemporaries, one older and the other younger.

II. p. 102)*. The village of Gauratnālaka,' which Jayanta's grandfather Kalyāna Svāmī is said to have acquired in consequence of having performed a सांग्रहणी sacrifice, is mentioned as Ghoramūlaka in the Rājatarangini, VIII, 1861. According to Dr. Stein it was situated in the territory of Rājapuri within the boundaries of Dārvābhīsāra (Kalhāna's Chronicles of the Kings of Kashmir, by Stein, Vol. II, pp. 144-5, foot note to verse 1861†.

* Dr. Stein makes it comprise "the whole tract" of the lower and middle hills lying between the Vitastā and Chāndrabhāgā" (See Stein's Trans., Vol. I, p. 32, foot note to verse 180).

† असंवितामद् एव यामकामः सांग्रहणीं गृत्वान् स इटिसगामिसमन्वयमेव गोमूलके पामवापि । Nyāya Mañjari, p. 274. Dr. Stein has fallen into a twofold mistake here (i) in taking Abhinanda to be the author of Nyāyamañjari and (ii) in calling Jayanta's father by the name of Kānta. The second mistake, based on Buhler's false rendering (Ind Ant II, p. 104) evidently arose from a misunderstanding of the following verse of Kādambarī Kathāsāra:

चांद्राद्वयाचरमात् परमधर्मदत्तन् । चजायत् मुमः कान्तशन्द्रो दुष्मोदपोरिन्

Here the meaning is plain enough. The word Chandra has to be taken in a double sense signifying the name of the son as well as the Moon. The epithet कान्त would be applicable in both the cases. That this interpretation is the right one would appear from the fact that Jayanta himself mentions Chandra as his father in the end of Nyāya Mañjari (p. 659¹⁴).

‡ A genealogy of Jayanta's family, constructed from the statements of his son, is appended below:

SAKTI (Gauja Brāhmaṇa of the Bharadvāja Gotra)

MITRA

SAKTISVĀMIN, minister (प्रभु) of King Muktapūja (Lalitaditya) of the Karkota family. (See Raj. Tar., LV. 42).

KALYĀNA SVĀMIN, a great Sacrificer and Yogi.

CHANDRA, a great Controversialist

JAYANTA.

king Śinkarvamān whom Jayanta describes as घमत्तद्वा and to whom he attributes (p. 271) the credit of having suppressed the नीलाम्बरमत् apparently a very obscene rite, cannot be identified with certainty. From Jayanta's words it would seem, as Col. Jacob has rightly guessed (J. R. A. S. 1911 p. 511) that the king was a Jain*

Jayanta was known to his contemporaries as a वृत्तिकार (Ny. Manj. p. 659[†] cf. Kadambati Kātha Sara, Introduction) or the author of a gloss on the Nyāya Sutras of Gotama †. Probably Nyaya Manjari is the gloss here referred to. Gunaratna in his Commentary on Śaddarsana Samuchchaya ascribes to Jayanta a Commentary on Nyaya Sara, named Nyaya Kalika. It is not known whether this Commentary is now extant. Buhler notices a work of the same name by Jayanta in his Kashmir Report (Nos. 385-7, p. CXLV)‡, but until its contents are examined it would be impossible to say anything as to its identity.

The style of Nyaya Manjari deserves special mention. It is unique of its kind, racy, humorous, brilliant, with a poignancy that is almost biting in its pointedness§. It is

* There was a king of this name in Kashmir, but the anachronism of his time (881-902 A.D.) and the fact of his being described by Kalhana as a worthless prince (V. Tattava-ga) precludes the possibility of this identification.

† Cf. Rajasēkha as Śaddarsana Samuchchaya, p. 10³.

‡ Cf. also Stein Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS., Jammu p. 148, No. 1,553. The opening benedictory sloka of this Commentary is the same as in Nyaya Manjari (p. 1, verse 1) but the concluding verse runs thus:

अवातरसनिष्टन्दमनभिवक्तव्यरम्भ । न्याय य कलिकामात्र जयमि पर्यटिष्ठु ॥

It is likely, considering the meanings of the words अवातर and न्याय, that the former was a smaller work on the same subject (i.e. a gloss on the Nyaya Sutras). However, this is only a conjecture.

§ Abhinanda thus describes the style of his father

सरसा सद्गुरुरा प्रसादमधुरा गिर । कोऽग्रस्तातज्यन्तस्य इयं च जगत् युप ॥

wonderfully eloquent, sweeping everything before its tremendous rush the arguments of the Laukayātikas as mercilessly as those of the Mīmāṃsakas. All through the work there runs a deep vein of religious earnestness & sense of personal conviction which renders its remarks on the views of the opponents so caustic and bitter. Thus for instance, we read on p 204—

ये त्वीश्वरं निरपवादद्वधमाण
सिद्धस्वक्षपमपि नाभ्युपयन्ति मूढा ।
पापाय तै सह कथापि विनन्यमाना
जायते नूनमिति युक्तमतो विरन्तुम् ॥

Cf also on p 236 —

मीमांसका यश. पिवन्तु पथो गा गिवन्तु बुद्धिजाडथारनय-
नाय ग्राहीतृतं चा पिवन्तु चरस्तु पुष्पप्रणीत एव नात्र चान्ति ।

The general Saiva Culture of Kashmir exercised a marked influence on Jayanta's personal creed. He was a Saiva through and through. In his discussion on theism he shows a decided bias towards the Kashmirian form of this faith. Like Bhāskaravajī and other Śivite philosophers he too conceives of the Divinity as Śiva (p 200¹¹ 2⁵) and predicates of Him 5, rather than 3, of the 9 Vīra-egregia pertaining to the Ātman. It is interesting to note that among these qualities, all eternal, we find both धर्म and सुख (besides the usual trio, viz शान, इच्छा and रूपि). He says—धर्मस्तु भूतानुग्रहयतो वस्तुस्वभाव्याद् मवन् न वार्यते तस्य फलं परमार्थनिरपत्तिरेव । सुखं तस्य नियमेव नियानन्दत्वेनागमात् प्रतीते (p 201¹²⁻¹⁴). Now in the mouth of a Nayayika this would appear to be a remarkable confession. For though strictly speaking धर्म is not denied to Ivara in the orthodox system (cf 1) Vartika, Benares Ed—या धर्म इश्वर नासौ तथैभ्यर्य करोति किन्तु प्रत्यात्मकृतीन् धर्मधर्मसत्तिचगाननु-गृहणाति (p 404³⁻⁴) it is admitted only as a matter of concession. Thus Ladvotakara expresses his own views—न चेश्वरे

धर्मोऽस्ति (Ny Va, p 464⁶) and एतत् न कु॒या महे यथा वृद्धि-
मचायामीश्वरस्य प्रमाणसद्भावो न चैवं पर्मीदिनित्यत्वे प्रमाणम-
स्ति &c (Ny Vā, p 464¹³⁻¹⁵) Vāchaspati, too, says almost
the same thing (See Tāt Tīka, p 420²¹⁻³) Similarly as
regards the existence of नित्यसुख and its presence in Iṣvara
(and with some, in the *mukta atman* as well), the usual evidence
of the Nyaya Vaisheshika is decidedly against it The following
words of Udayana may serve as the pith of their arguments

नित्यं तु सुखं न सत्यं योग्यानुपलभ्याचित्तवात् ।
भूतिस्तत्र प्रमाणमिति चेत्, न । योग्यानुपलभ्याचित्ते तदनवकाशात्,
अवकाशे वा प्रायस्त्वनथुतेरपि तथाभावप्रसङ्गात् ।
[Ātmatattva viveka (Tarkapanchānana's Ed., p 95¹⁴⁻¹⁷)]*

VI — VYOMASIVACHARYA.

Vyoma Sivacharya, as the name indicates, seems to me to have been a Śaiva Saint of the South. Though a high authority on Vaisheshika philosophy his name has practically been forgotten Rajasekhara, in his commentary on the NyayaKandali (Nyaya Kandalipañchikā), credits him with the authorship of a commentary named Vyomavati on Prasastapada's Padartha dharma Sangraha This commentary was long believed to have been lost, but it has recently been recovered and a transcribed copy of it exists in the Government Sanskrit Library Benares, from which it appears that the work more than ordinarily deserved the renown which it once universally enjoyed It is likely that the Acharya of whom Udayana speaks in the Kiranavali is no other than Vyomasiva, and that Śridhara also presumably made use of his predecessor's work in writing the Kandali

Vyomasiva was the leader, at any rate a learned represen-

* Comparing the statements of Jayanta and Udayana it appears that their attitudes towards Āgama were quite distinct In this regard in spite of slight differences Jayanta and Bhasarvajua side together

tative of a distinct section of Vaisesika school and commanded a great influence on contemporary and subsequent thought. He accepted *Sabda* as a separate pramana and had no sympathy with the people who suggested that the Vaisesika did not admit the independence of verbal testimony as a valid source of knowledge. In regard to this view of his Manibhadra gives the following report in commenting on Haribhadra's *Saddarsana Samuchchaya* (Chowkh Ed., p 63) यद्यपि श्रोतृक्षयशासने व्योमशिवाचार्यांकिन प्रीणि प्रमाणानि, तथापि श्रीधरमतापेक्षया भव उभे एव निगदिते। It is clear from this that there was already a split in the school which was due perhaps to the interpretation of the true import of the Sutra (Vais.) 9 3 3, and was not of comparatively recent occurrence. Among the advocates of dual pramana we find the names of scholars like Śridhara, Śivāditya, Vallabhacharya Udayana (), Rājasekhara (see his *Saddarsana Samuchchaya*, Ya.ovijaya Ed., verse 114, p 11) &c* And Suresvaracharya, in his *Manasollasa*, II 17 (Mys Ed., p 49), also subscribes to this view†. On the contrary, the interpretation of Vyomasiva is confirmed by the statements of Sankaracharya in the *Sarvavidhantasaṅgraha* (V 33, p 22) and of Jinadatta in the *Viveka Vilasa* (Bhand Rep 1883-'84, p 462)‡.

The only other references to Vyoma Śiva which I have hitherto found in Sanskrit philosophical literature occur in

* Gau lapadacharya, while commenting on *Saukhya Kanka* 4, plainly refers to the Vaisesika opinion as being in favour of the duality of pramana यद्यपि वैष्णविके यद्दो नाभ्युपेष्टते तथापि ते न प्रमातर (Ben. Ed., p 5)

† Cf. Jayanarayaya's *Sarvadarśana Saṅgraha* in the vernacular, p. 45

‡ वैष्णविक मते तावद् नमायामद्य भवति । प्रवृत्तमनुमानं च तार्चीयेकमयागम (Vivekavilasa). In the शृङ्खृति to *Vise avasyakabhasya* (Ben. Ed. p 666) the Vaisesikas are credited with the theory of three pramanas ३ । वैष्णवस्त्रेन प्रत्यरात्रुमानामवद्या प्रमाणप्रदग्धायस्तम् ।

Vidindra's *Rasasara**; and Vallabha's *Nyayalakshmi* (Bomb Ed., p. 98)

VII — UDAYANACHARYA

The last great representative of the older schools of Nyaya and Vaisesika was beyond question Udayanacharya.

Jayanta and Vachaspati Misra wrote on Nyaya, while Śridhara wrote on Vaisesika, but the credit of combining for the first time the two allied systems into a joint form is, according to tradition, due to Udayana. And it was he who made the most pronounced effort to combat the anti-theistical tendencies of his age by bringing philosophy to the service of theology. His *Atmatattvaviveka* & *Nyaya Kusumanjali*

* पतेन एतमदत्तविषयविद्याद्वये नति स्वाक्षर्येकजातीय० यद्यद्वक्तव्यं विशेषगुणं इति न्योमशिवाचार्येकापि काम्यं प्रत्युत्तम् । स्वाक्षर्येकजातायपदेन नवान्यतमस्य विविधत्वात् (Rasasara, p. 11)

† For instance, in *Nyaya Kusumajali* which being an independent treatise afforded ample opportunities to the author for sufficient freedom of expression we find in several places the characteristic doctrines of Nyaya and Vaisesika fused up with one another. To take one example. The Vaisesika does not admit Upamana and Sabda to be separate pramanas but Udayana, in agreement with the orthodox Naiyayika's standpoint (Ibid III 12 Benares Ed pp. 5 - 57 & pp. 57 etc), makes it a definite point to prove that their separate character cannot be gainsaid. But on the other hand while dealing with the question of Svapna or dream-consciousness he subscribes to the usual Vaisesika view of the point with some modification. Thus though the Naiyayika and the Vaisesika are both at one on the falsity of dream consciousness, the former considers it as a kind of अनुभव, whereas the latter makes it fall under the category of अनुभव and so distinct from व्युति. Udayana agrees with the Vaisesika in so far as he maintains the presentative character of dream consciousness (अनुभव व्याप्तिः स्वीकृतः, Ny Kusu, V Ben Ed p. 147) but differs from him in holding that even dreams may come occasionally true (आत्म न सप्नानुभवस्यापि करपादित सत्यतः, सावादातः, Ibid.)

are the best polemical treatises ever written with the avowed object of disposing of the Buddhist contentions against the doctrines of Ātman and Iṣvara and of placing their truth on a firm and secure footing.

There is no doubt now as to the age of Udayanachārya. He lived in the fourth quarter of the 10th century as evidenced by the following sloka at the end of his Lekṣājavālī:

तर्कान्तराङ्कुप्रमितेष्वतीतेषु रक्षात्ततः ।
वर्षपूर्वदयनश्चे सुयोधा लक्षणायलाभ् ॥

This gives 906 Śaka or 951 A.D. for the composition of Lekṣājavālī and as this was not probably his very last piece his period of life may be carried some more years forward.

Udayana was a contemporary of Śridhara but it is not possible with the resources now available to determine which of them was the older. His Lekṣājavālī was 7 years earlier than the Kāndali but there seems to be reason to believe that his Kāndali was a later work. Besides the case already cited by Pundit Vindhyaeswar Trasi Lal Dube (Preface to Nyāya Kāndali p 21, f note 5) where the view of Śridhara appears to be cited and refuted in the Kāndali, there is one positive instance of a similar kind. Thus the view on तम् as the imposed blue colour which is associated with Śridhara's name (cf Suryadatta's Su graha & Dinakarī) is rejected in the Kāndali (pp 19-20) and though the name of Śridhara is nowhere mentioned by Udayana it is nevertheless sure that his views were familiar to him. But Udayana did not live to complete the work thus initiated which broke off abruptly in its course with गुरुद्वयः. I think that on the death of Udayana Śridhara still living, began to revise his book in the light of the criticisms made not failing however in his turn to cast a sting at Udayana whenever occasion permitted. This is my own suggestion.

and may be accepted as a tentative explanation of the otherwise quite unintelligible fact of both Udayana and Śridhara quoting and refuting each other's views*

Udayana was a Śāṅkara and though professedly a Naiyayika he had the highest regard for Vedānta in its most rigorous and unfalsified form. His notion of Nyaya, too, was unique. His conception of the mutual relations of the various systems of Indian philosophy, orthodox and heterodox is extremely interesting. I am reminded here of the remarkable passage in the Atmatattvaviveka where he attempts to show that in its gradual ascent along the path of moksha the soul is confronted with views which broaden out more and more. The different schools of philosophy representing the varied views thus obtained in passing are conceived to form a graduated series, arranged according to an ascending scale of spiritual realisation, and in such a scheme the lower is always supposed to be a stepping stone to the higher and is to be *superseeded* by it †. Udayana's works may be thus tabulated.

A Commentaries on

- (a) Gotama's Sutras (*न्यायपरिशिद्*)
- (b) Prasastapada's Padarthadharmā Saṅgraha (*किरणी वक्ती*) It was the last work of Udayana, and contains references to Atmatattvaviveka and Nyayakusumanjali (p 147)
- (c) Vachaspati Miśra's Nyaya Vārtika tatparyatīkā (*न्यायवाचिकता॒॑पर्यपरिशिद्* or *न्यायनिवेद्य*)

* For Śridhara referring to Udayana's views, see Preface to Nyaya Kandah p 21 f note 3

† This attempt at Synthesis, though incidental, may be taken to be one of the earliest of its kind on record and though brief is matchless in its grandeur. Sarvajnatma Muni's earlier attempt (in Saṅkṣepa Śāṅkara) and Madhusudana's (in Prasthanabhedā) and Vijnasabhuksu's (in his Introduction to Saṅkhyā pravachana Bhāṣya) later ones pale before it in comparison.

B (a) आत्मतत्त्वाविवेक (known also as घौढ़ाधिकार or घौढ़ा-चिकार). This was probably one of his earliest works. It is a splendid production, and represents probably the most vigorous defence of the Theory of Self on behalf of Nyaya against the merciless assaults of the Buddhist philosophers.

(b) न्यायकुसुमाञ्जलि, consisting of 5 chapters, partly in prose and partly in verse. It contains a reference to Atmatattvaviveka.

(c) लक्षणावली* This is a very useful booklet, containing a series of definitions of terms pertaining to the Vaiseṅika philosophy. It was composed in 906 Śakabda or 984 A. D and was therefore earlier than the Kiranavali which succeeded the Nyāya Kandali written in 991 A. D. So I do not find any warrant for Mr Chikravarti's opinion (J A S B, Sept., 1915, p 263) that the Kiranavali preceded Lakṣaṇāvali. The fact that the last sloka of Lakṣaṇāvali is the same as the opening verse of the Kiranavali really proves nothing. For we might as well argue from this fact that the former was earlier than the latter.

(d) प्रधोषसिद्धि, an original treatise in Nyāya, probably compiled from Vatsyāyaṇa, Uddyotakara and Vāchaspati (cf T Rāksā, p 308⁹⁻¹¹) Varadaraja refers to it four times in the Tarkikarakāraṇa (pp 189, 190, 308, 343 & 357), and though he does not attribute it to Udayana by name

* Mallinatha in his Commentary on Tarkikarakāraṇa makes Udayana the author of Laksanamala (pp 179⁹, 225¹⁸), but this seems to be a case of erroneous ascription. Laksanamala was the work of Śivaditya and not of Udayana. Probably the mistake arose from a confusion of Laksanamala with Udayana's Laksanavali. That Varadaraja does not refer to Udayana's work follows from the facts that once (p 179) he explicitly mentions Laksanamala by name as the source of his quotations and that in both the cases the statements cited do not occur in the Laksanavali.

there can be no doubt about Udayana's authorship of it^{*} from the fact that Varadaraja once speaks of the author as Acharya (p. 308¹⁰ 11), a term generally reserved by the later Nyāyayikas for Udayana (and sometimes for Vāchaspati also). †

VIII.—SRIDHARA

As the author of Nyāya Kandali, a Commentary on Prasastapadī's Padarthadharmī Samgraha, Śridhara's reputation has come down to posterity. He was a great scholar, the lust of that glorious land whose depth of learning was commensurate with their range of studies. In Nyāya his fame is known to be well established. Later writers have always acknowledged his authority, and though some of his personal opinions, such as the view on तम् ‡, are rejected in the subsequent history of this philosophy, the eminence of his position in the world of Indian thinkers remains still unaffected by it.

* Cf. Intro to Tarkikarakṣa, p. 7, Aufrecht, Cat. Cat I, 65 (here the name appears as दोषसिद्ध).

† For example, see Tarkikarakṣa, p. 159 13-14, where Varadaraja quotes Udayana's definition of Viśesa under the name of आचार्य (Mallinatha makes आचार्य = किंवद्वत्कार) Cf. Tarkikarakṣa, p. 105⁵⁻⁶ (तदेत् सर्वं वायकुमुमान्तः प्रपञ्चमाचार्यं), p. 65³ (चिद्रामप्याद्गुमाचमिचाचार्यं pp. 85⁶ 861-2, &c and also p. 77¹ (see Mallinatha's note).

‡ His view might appear to be outlandish to one accustomed to the usual way of thinking. To him तम् (darkness) is not mere असूर as with the orthodox Nyāyayika nor a kind of दूष made up of atomic particles as with the Mīmāṃsaka, but it is the blue colour and is therefore a quality (cf. for a summary of the different views on darkness, Athalve, Tarkasangraha Notes, pp. 78-79) Śridhara thus sums up his own conclusion on the question : तम्मादु सपादयेषां दृष्ट्य उद्देश्यादभाव सर्वं सर्वाः समारपित्वा इति प्रत वत ।

Śridhara is fortunately one of those few writers in the history of India who have left some account of themselves. He says in the Nyāya Kandali, pp 330 331, that he was born in the village of Bhūrisr̥ṣṭi in Southern Rājha (=दक्षिणराजायां भूरिस्रष्टि:) His parents' names are given as Baladeva and *Achoka* (or *Abbhoka*), and it appears that the Kāyastha gentleman named Pīndudāsa, at whose request he undertook to write this Commentary, was his patron.

Besides (a) न्यायकन्दङी^{*} which was composed in 913 Saka (श्याधिक दयोत्तर नवशतग्राम्ब) or 991 A D Śridhara had also written—

(b) अद्वयसिद्धि, an original work in Vedanta (Kandali, p 5)

(c) सत्त्वप्रवोध, an original work in Mīmāṃsā (Kand , pp 82, 146), and

(d) तत्त्वसंवादिनी (Kand , p 82)

Mr Chakravarti notes (*loc cit*) that Śridhara's Nyāya Kandali was "little used in Bengal or Mithila". But this does not seem to me to have been exactly the case, at least so far as Mithila is concerned. For though undoubtedly it was not so widely read as Udayana's Kiranavahī and was confined to the specialists alone, its studies continued for some centuries uninterrupted, and it was during these years of its flourishing condition that Commentaries used to be written upon it. Padmanabha wrote a Commentary upon it (*Nyāyakandalsara*) as he had done upon Udayana's parallel work, and looking at the

* सम्प्रहर्गीका (Kand p 159), was not a Commentary on some tréatise named Samgraha (=Kanada Samgraha?), as is usually supposed, but it was the name of the Kandali itself. If we remember that the Kandali was the Commentary on the Padartha dharma Samgraha, we can make out the meaning of the term.

[†] But in Kashmir, it would appear from Buhle's Report, it enjoyed a greater popularity.

opening verse of this commentary it would seem that Vardhamāna and other earlier writers had also commented upon it.* With the evidence for these Commentaries, all by Māthilas, before us it would be hard to accept Mr. Chakravarti's statement regarding *Mithila* as true. But as to the fact of the general disuse of the book in Bengal there exists no ground for raising any question. It is really a mystery how a work written in Bengal, by a Bengali author and with real claims to appreciation should have gone out of fashion in the country of its birth. It seems to me equally inexplicable how this work, just like Bhāsarvajña's Nyāya Śāra, could find such vogue among the Jain logicians. Rāja Śekhara wrote a Commentary upon it (*Nyāya Kandahpañjikā*. See Peterson's Report 3.272) and refers to it in his Śaddarsanasamuchchaya. Guṇaratna, in his gloss on Haribhadra's Śaddarsana samuchchaya and Mallīṣena in Śyādvāda mañjari (*Yaśovijaya* Ed., p 56) also refer to it, & so do many other Jaina writers.

IX.—ŚIVADITYA MISRA

The earliest reference of Nyāyāchārya † Śivaditya Miśra is found in Śriharṣa's *Khaṇḍana Khāḍya* where the former's definition of *prama* is strongly denounced. Śriharṣa's time being the 12th Century (M. Chakravarti, in J.A.S.B., 1915, p. 264), Śivāditya may be placed a century or more earlier.

* Thus in the sloka

अपदिष्ठा गुरुचरैषः सूक्ष्मा वर्षम् नादः.

कन्दम्यः साराण्यस्तन्यने प्रभनभेत् ॥

Intro. to Nyāya Kandali, p. 4.

[the expression अपदिष्ठा वर्षम् नादः plainly implies the existence of Commentaries upon the work by Vardhamāna and other authors gone before.

† Sankara Miśra employs this epithet for Śivāditya's name in his Commentary on *Khaṇḍana Khāḍya* (Ben. Ed., p. 144).

He seems to have been the author of two original works, both in Vaisesika viz (a) सप्तपदार्थी and (b) लक्षणमाला (See Pratyakṣvarupa's Commentary on Chitsukhi, Nir Sagara Ed., p 180, and Śankara Miśra's Commentary on Khandāna, p 144)

Pandit Vindhyesvari Prasad Dube (Intro to Prasastapada Bhāṣya and Nyāya Kandali, Viz Series p 19, f note 2) assumes the identity of this Śivāditya with Vyomasivacharya, the author of a Commentary on Prasastapada Bhāṣya. This assumption is not tenable. Probably this mis identification proceeded from a confusion due to similarity of names and to an erroneous reading in one of the MSS. of Saptapadarthī (cf Tailanga Rama Sastri's Ed. of Saptapadarthī, Preface, p 1. and the Text p 80, footnote)

Mr Chakravarti (J A S B 1915, p 262) attributes to Śivāditya the credit of having added the Category of abhava to the sixfold group of the older writers. But this view cannot be accepted without some reservation. For if it is meant by what he says that Śivāditya was the earliest known philosopher who gave to abhava a place of importance in the discussion of Categories and that he was *not* its introducer the view may be pronounced probable. But if it implies, as it seems to do, that he *added* it as a fresh Category not hitherto recognised in the system, the error is apparent. The distinctive position of the Vaisesika in the order of Indian Systems would suffer a deadly shock with the disappearance of Abhava. It forms with Samavaya and Viśeṣa, the keystone of the whole system. It is true that in the older works (e.g. Vai^ś Sut 1 1 4 Pras. Bhā. p 6, cf San. Sut 1 25 Kandali, p 331⁴) six categories are explicitly enounced, but it does not mean that abhava is not recognised as real. The reason why it is excluded from the usual formulation of the Categories, all positive, is thus stated by Śridhara.

अभावस्य पृथगनुपदेशः भावपारतन्त्रयात् त्वभावात् (Kandali, p. 7") । With the Vaisesika, (unlike the Sankhya), for whom प्रतीति (added to, but in a greater measure than, its counterpart व्यवहार) as an ultimate fact of consciousness given in the form of 'belief', is the determinant of objective reality, abhāva is necessarily real. It was under a metaphysical, rather than a logical, necessity that abhāva had to be postulated in this system. And the necessity thus felt was twofold, arising (a) from the fundamental assumption of the school that Moksha is really negative*, (b) and from its doctrine of असत्कार्यचाद which allows of a real negative judgment. To illustrate this point we may revert to the position of सत्कार्यचाद such as that of सांख्य or योग to see that a really negative predicate can have no place in its theory of predication. It being assumed here that everything exists everywhere, or one thing is identical with another ("जात्य-भूच्छेन सर्वं सर्वात्मकं" Vyāsa's Com. on Yoga Sutra III-14.) all negation would be merely verbal (वैकल्पिक). Let us take an example

(1) The judgment घटो नास्ति or more explicitly मृत्तिकायां घटो नास्ति would be a real judgment according to the Vaisesika and lend itself to a double interpretation—(i) it may mean that the jar, being not yet produced, does not exist in the Matter (मृत्तिका); this would be प्रागभाव; or (ii) it may mean that the jar, being destroyed, does not exist in the Matter (मृत्तिका); this would be वृंस। But both these kinds of abhāva are according to the Sankhya-Yoga really two forms of bhāva (there being no room for असत् in this system), the one known as the अनागतधर्म and the other as the

* According to the Vaisesika Moksha being conceived as an absence of qualities, a separate category other than positive was rendered necessary. This was named अभाव

(अतीतधर्म of the Matter मृत्तिका) Both are equally positive in content The judgment घटो नास्ति, therefore as in (i) and (ii), or more strictly मृत्तिका घटाभाववतो, would be a pseudo judgment the true (of course relatively) judgment taking the form of मृत्तिका घट चती, even when the घट is not produced or is already destroyed In other words while in Sankhya Yoga अभाव is not allowed to be a real predicate or धर्म, in Nyaya Vaisesika it is It may be observed that the Vaisesika allows only what is called in Sankhya Yoga वर्तमानधर्मः i e आदितधर्म to be a positive predicate That is, घट may be a positive predicate of मृत्तिका or मृत्तिका may be said to be the आधार of घट, only after its production and before its destruction, in other words when it is वर्तमान। And for explaining this presence or वर्तमानता of the product in the Matter, the relation of समवाय has to be assumed But before the production and after the destruction घट is negatively predicable This is a fundamental difference between the two systems, resulting necessarily from the two assumptions of सत्त्वकार्य or असत्त्वकार्य। Naturally therefore the अतीत & अनागत वस्तु though admitted to be प्रमेय or object (विषय) of right knowledge are held in the Nyaya Vaisesika as असत् or non existing (but not तुच्छ or अवस्तु as the Buddha might say), i e ध्वंस and प्राप्तभाव are respectively predicable of them

(B) Similarly the judgment पटो घटो न where the quality of the objects घट and घट is denied would be a false judgment according to Sankhya Yoga Really पट being identical with घट (तदात्मक) there is no ground for such negation But since the Nyaya Vaisesika does not hold प्रकृतिकारण्याद or the doctrine of the Immanence and Unity of Matter of which the manifold (वैचित्र्य) given in experience is more or less (i e graded) a manifestation, and

consequently is an advocate of absolute difference (अत्यन्तभेद) between one thing and another, it cannot do without what is technically called अन्योन्याभाव

(C) And so with अत्यन्ताभाव too. Everything being every where and so there being no possibility of any relation (संसर्ग) like संयोग or समवाय which implies the existence of two really distinct objects अत्यन्ताभाव is no more than a verbal fiction.

Briefly speaking then the प्रकृतिवाद of the Sankhya, of which सत्कार्यवाद is an aspect leaves it no room for real अभाव (or सम्बन्ध) All predication is reduced to identification धर्मी or logical subject i.e कारण (उपादान) is identical with धर्म or predicate i.e कार्य Matter (प्रकृति) is the subject in the last resort, and all else, viz the products (विकृति s), are its predicates These predicates, all positive, are each threefold in character—अतीत अनागत & वर्तमान, this division being founded on the bare fact of succession given in the limited consciousness (वृत्त्यांसक ज्ञान) and not on the reality (स्वरूपत) in which all the predicates co-exist and are identical with the subject That is to say, time itself being a product predicates appear within it as successive, but beyond it in Eternity—or in मूला प्रकृति, the predicates are already given as existing together and somehow inexplicably identical with it This is तादात्म्य [From this it will be plain why Sankhya Yoga does not feel the necessity of admitting सामान्य and विशेष, both predicates, as distinct categories And real difference being denied, it is easy to understand how the necessity of समवाय also is dispensed with]

The Vaishesika, on the other hand, with his assumption of real difference corresponding to and necessitated by the difference in प्रत्यय and व्यवहार was thrown upon the असत्कार्यवाद

(which is, looked at from a slightly different standpoint the same thing as भारस्मचात् & परमाणुचात्) which led him in logical course to maintain the reality of succession and with this of what are technically termed प्रागभाव & द्वंस Their अन्योन्यभाव also follows naturally from the view of the reality of difference given in consciousness, viz घट is other than not घट e.g पट This is in logical terms nothing but a combined statement of the principles of Identity and Contradiction, thus symbolically A=A, & A=not-not A It seems to have been the outcome of a reaction against the extreme views of the Sāṅkhya on one hand with whom A=B and of the Bauddha on the other with whom A=not A A real समर्ग (संयोग and समचाय) being admitted, its absence led to the postulation of असमर्गभाव।

Without entering into further detail in this place it may be just said that the concept of abhava is so intimately bound up with this system as a whole that its denial would mean the overthrow of its distinctive character.

Then again in the actual texts of the older writers abhava is found recognised Cf Ny Sat 228 et seq, Nyaya Vartika, pp 278 280, २८१-२९४ Tat १ का, pp ३०६-३०७ & Nyaya Manjari Even Kanada himself, though not mentioning it in his enumeration of the Categories (114), devotes some sūtras to a discussion of it in the 9th chapter Thus the absence of Kanāda's mention of it by name in the उद्देशसूत्र is no proof against its recognition by him Vallabhacharya says— अभावस्य च ममानतन्वं सिद्धस्याप्रतिपिद्धस्य न्यायदर्शने मानसेन्द्रियतासिद्धिवदनापि अविरोधादभ्युपगमसिद्धान्तसिद्धिवात्। Nyaya Lilavati, Nir, Sagara Ed

To this Sanlara Misra adds the following explanatory notes in his Nyaya Lilavati Krishnabharana (Mc belonging to the Benares Sanskrit Library) तेषु लक्षितलक्षणवात् (Corr reading लक्षितप्रलक्षितलक्षणवात्) इत्यादि सुधे

न्यायश्वरे एमनि तद्विभावश्य व्युत्पादितःरादत्र च तदप्रति-
वेष्टात् परमतमश्रितिपद्मभूमतमिति न्यायेन स्त्रकृतः श्राभ्युप-
गमनो नयनात् । यथा गातमेन मनस इः द्रुयत्वं नोक्तमप्रतिवेष्टा-
धादभ्युपगतश्च ।

Vol 5 a^o-8

I think it has now been demonstrated that there is no warrant for asserting, as Mr Chakravarti has done (*loc. cit.*), that Siv ditya “*abha*” abhva “to the six categories of the older writers” * He simply explicated, giving to it the name of the 7th category, what had already been recognised in the system as a real Category

X — VARADARĀJA

The exact time of Varadaraja's life is very hard of determination. Dr Venis places him in the interval between 1050 & 1300 A D or more definitely about the first half of the 12th century (Prefatory notice to *Tarkikarakṣa*, p. iii) Though a greater precision is not attainable on this matter in the present state of our knowledge, a word or two may be suggested here. Jñ napṛīa, whose time cannot be later than the 13th century and possibly was much earlier, alludes in the beginning of his commentary called *Laghudipikā* to Varadaraja as having lived long ago (पुरा). This would appear to furnish a plea for pushing back this date by some decades at any rate. And the constant references to Udayana in the *Tarkikarakṣa* seem to me to indicate, not merely

* Mr Chakravarti is equally wrong in his assertion (*loc. cit.*, 262) made apparently on the authority of Kandali, p 331, that Sridhara “acknowledged only six categories”. As indicated in the line quoted from the Kandili on p 118 above this assertion is unfounded. Sridhara did acknowledge abhava (note the phrase न त्वमावात्) as a *real* category of existence. Compare also Kandali p 230, lines 3-23

that Varadaraja was his admirer but that he was his close successor as well. As a provisional step, therefore, I would prefer to claim for him as his approximate date the middle of the 11th Century*.

Varadaraja is known to have written only three works
A Commentaries on
(a) Udayana's

i न्यायकुसुमाञ्जलि (= योधनी), Mallinatha refers to it in his Commentary on the Tarkikaraksa (p. 46) पतञ्च ग्रन्थकृतैव स्पष्टेषु कृतं न्यायकुसुमाञ्जलिटोक्यामित्यात्तां तावत्। Burnell (Tanjore Catalogue, p. 123) notices a copy of this Commentary existing in the Palace Library of Tanjore, where the name of the author's father is given as Mahamahopādhyaya Rama deva Misra †

ii विरणावली (See Aufrecht, Cat. Cat., I pp. 107, 550)
B तार्किकरच्चा, sometimes called तर्ककारिका, a treatise on Nyāya consisting of 160 Kārikas distributed in three chapters (97+34+29) and of a Commentary named सारसंग्रह. The book is referred to in the Sivadarśana Sangraha

* Mr Chakravarti's assertion (*loc. cit.* p. 26) that 'Vardhamana is the oldest Commentator known on Udayana's works' is thus found to be no longer tenable

† A Ms. of this work, as far as Chap III was obtained by the present writer in 1916. It had been transcribed in Śaka 1436 (1514 A.D.) and belonged to the private collection of Sarva Vidyanidhana Kavindracarya Sarasvatī whose name appears in bold hand on the first and last leaves. It has since been edited by the writer with a historical Introduction for the Sarasvatī Bhavaṇa Texts No. 4 (Benares)

XI—VALLABHACHARYA

Vallabhacharya was one of the greatest authorities on Vaisesika philosophy next only to Udayanacharya, in the mediaeval period of its history. There are certain peculiar views associated with his name in subsequent literature, but as we have dealt with them at length in our forthcoming work on the history of Nyaya-Vaiseiska philosophy, there is no use reverting to them here.

He was the author of *Nyayabhasavati*, an independent * work on Vaisesika. This work has had the rare good fortune, viz. much like Gangesa's *Tattva Chintamani*, of finding a host of commentators.

Vallabha's nationality is not known. But his date may be assigned with tolerable certainty to the end of the 12th Century A D †.

VII—SASADHARA

It is believed that Sasadhara was one of the great Nyayikas of the pre-Gangesa School and that in Gangesa's *Tattva Chintamani* there is a reference to his definition of Vyapti‡. As there is no mention of Gangea or his successors in Sasadhara's work available to us there is no inherent improbability in the correctness of this belief.

* *Nyayabhasavati* is apparently an independent work, based on and planned after, *Prasastapada's Bhasya*. It is said that on this Vaiseiska *Bhasya* there was a commentary by Sri Vatsa called *Nyayabhasavati*. If Sri Vatsa is held identical with Vallabha Nyaya *bhasavati* will have to be considered as a commentary on the *Bhasya*, just as the *Bhasya* itself is on the *Sutras*.

† Vallabha is referred to in (a) *Vidinendra's Rasasra* (about 1225 A D) and in (b) a Kannarese poem written by a poet under King Singhan of the Yadava dynasty of Devagiri (about 1226 A D).

‡ Tradition identifies "Sishka (Lion) and 'Vyayhra (Tiger) whose definitions of Vyapti have been quoted by Gangesa under

Sasadhara may therefore be placed between Udayana to whom he refers and Gangeśa, i.e. in the middle of the twelfth century.

He was the author of *Nyāya-siddhānta-dīpa*, an excellent treatise on Nyāya.*

VIII—VADINDRA

Mahādeva Sarvajña Vādindra was one of the greatest polemic writers in the field of Nyāya-Vaisesika in mediaeval India and deserves to be ranked, so far as dialectical abilities are concerned, with Śrī Harī and similar other writers.

He is said to have been the pupil of one Yogivara. His name Vādindra is apparently due to his reputation among his contemporaries as a great controversialist, and we know that Chitsukha and other subsequent writers referred to him under this very name. His pupil Bhūṭṭa Raghava speaks very often, in his Commentary on *Nyāyasāra*, of his large following. Vādindra was a votary of Śiva (cf. the benedictory verses of his works), and it is not unlikely that the words Sankara Kinkarī as used in Madhvā's *Sarva-darsana-Saṅgrahī* (*Anandāśrama* Ed., p 95) and Hūra Kinkarī as in the Colophon of the Mīthā-

the name शिव व्याजोर्लक्षण, with Sasadhara (or Sasidhara) and Mayidhara. It is not known whether this tradition has a historical basis, and if so, who these two persons really were. Dr Satish Chandra is inclined to believe that the names 'Lion' and 'Tiger' represent the Jain Logicians, Ananda Suri and Amarachandra Suri. See his Ind. Logic, p 396.

* Aufrecht (Cat. Cat I, p 63b) ascribes the following works to Vādindra: (a) *Nyāya-sāra*, (b) *Nyāya-mimāṃsa-prakaraṇa*, (c) *Nyāya-vratnaptakarṇa*, and (d) *Sāividhi-mimāṃsa*. That the last is a separate work is evident. According to the Ind. Off. Cat., p 64b, (c) is another name of *Nyāya-siddhānta-dīpa* itself, while in Burnell (p 119, i.e. *Nyāya-sāra*) is the name of a Com. on *Nyāya-Siddhānta-dīpa* by Dharmaraya Brahma. *Nyāya-sāra* and *Nyāya-mimāṃsa* too are probably not different works.

vidya viñambana are to be understood as meaning a 'devotee of Siva rather than a 'pupil of the Acharya named Śankara or Hara. He describes himself in his work on the Mahāvidyā as the Dharmadhyakṣa of King Śri Simha, whom Mr M R Telang identifies with Rāja Singhā of the Yādava dynasty of Devagir.

The manuscript of Bhaṭṭa Raghava's Nyāyasaravichitra, which exists in the Government Sanskrit Library, Benares, is dated in Śakaabda 1174 (= 1252 A D). * But Rāghava was the direct pupil of Vādīndra as he says expressly in his colophons as well as in the beginning of his commentary Vādīndra may therefore be placed in the early part of the 13th Century. This date synchronises well with the time of his patron, Rāja Singhā or Śri Simha.

Vādīndra was the author of the following works

(1) Mahāvidvaviñambanī

It has been published in the Gaekwad's Oriental Series, No XII. It was perhaps the *magnum opus* of this gifted author and created quite a sensation in his time. His great controversialistic genius appears at its best in this work, where he attempts to prove the futility and defects of the so called Mahāvidyā syllogisms, which played an important part in the history of mediaeval Indian Logic.

(2) Rasasari

This is a Commentary on the Guna Kiranāvalī of Udayana. It has been published in the Sarasvati Bhavana Sanskrit Texts of Benares (No 5).

(3) Kavadasutri nibandhat

(4) A Commentary on Udayana's Laksānāvalī

See Śāṅgadharī, in his Commentary, Nyāyamuktāvalī,

* For a discussion of this date see under *Bhṛgī & ghara*

† See M R Telang's Introduction to the Mahāvidyā viñambana, p XVI

मभ्युगस्य निर्विकल्पकजनकरारीरसंयोगप्रिकरणःये सति याग-
जपमीजयज्ञस ज्ञातकाराविद्यत्वे सति शरीर वानधिकरण-
मिन्द्रियमिति यथाभृतमेवैतद् व्याचक्षते (Ben. Ed., p 29). This
passage would seem to show that Vādiśa whom I take to be
identical with Vādīndra wrote a Commentary on Laksanāvali.
The name Vādīndra also occurs in the same Commentary (cf
p. 23), and the term Vādīndra being only an honorific title
there is no inherent difficulty in understanding the two names
as representing one person. It is much like शुद्धर्साक्षर
being substituted by हरकिद्धर as already noted.

(5) A metrical philosophical treatise:

The name of this tract does not appear. But the quotations under Vādīndra's name as given in the Sarva-
darśana Saṅgraha and Nyāyasāravichāra being in verse it
seems likely that he was the author of a metrical tract.

XIV—BHĀTTA RAGHAVA.

Bhātta Raghava's Commentary on Bhāsarvajña's Nyāya
Sāra (न्यायसारविचार) is the only work from his pen known
to philosophical bibliography, and though it does not seem to
have ever been widely used in later times its importance is
none the less very great. Apart from the fact that this book
furnishes a clear exposition of Bhāsarvajña's doctrines which
it professes to defend from the attacks of opponents, it
contains a number of lengthy discussions relating to certain
topics raised in the text which are historically of great value
to a student of contemporary philosophy.

There exists a manuscript of this Commentary in the
Government Sanskrit Library, Benares (fols. 2—100), where
in the Colophon the date of its composition is given as 1174
Saka or 1252 A. D.*

* The verse in which the date appears runs thus.
यके चनुः प्रतिस्थवक गते यताधौ न्यौ के च चामः ।

द्विषांतिरहतं वभूत वात्तर्घुव विचारः परिभावि—वा ॥

his Guru was Māthādevī Sarvajñā Vālindra (See the Colophons at the end of each chapter fol. 19^a b¹ 72^a &

[The meaning of the last phrase is not clear but the reading is exactly as given above. There is no room for reading विस्तुष्टि राद्य, as the late Mr Satis Chandra (Introduction to Nyāya p. 7) has done. After ते of मति the e is visible as a stroke, the consonant following having disi paur d and the last letter with which the next line begins is a न and not a ण so that the final word of the verse cannot be read नै इग्न। The Ms. is generally free from slips and is carefully corrected.]

Of the two ways of interpreting this verse, viz. (1) [(500 x 2) + 100] + 74 = 1174 Śaka or 12^a 2 A.D. and (2) [(500 + 100) x 2] + 74 = 1274 Śaka or 13^a A.D., I should prefer the former interpretation. Apart from the convincing historical grounds adduced by Mr Telang (Introduction to Mahāvījavidambana pp. vii-viii) there is another fact to be considered. In the Ms. named above there is an entry evidently by a later hand that the Ms. was purchased by one Visṇu from one Udaya Śinhi for 25 (?) pieces in Samvat 1428 (= 1371 A.D.) विष्णुमिश्रकौटुम्बक उदयशिंह (नि (१) नवम्ये कौटुम्बिकाः ॥ सप्त १४ च अष्टमा सम्य उपाय वदि २ द्वितीया रथो ॥ अष्टमानार्द्धमस्तु ॥ अ ॥ आ ॥ शो ॥ This statement shows that the Ms. was purchased in 1371 A.D. Consequently the date of transcription must be earlier and that of composition much earlier still. In view of this circumstance the alternative of 1372 A.D. as the date of the composition of the work does not strike me as probable. I therefore accept the former interpretation of the verse and take the date to represent 12^a 2 A.D. Cf also Hall (Bibl. Index, p. 6).

* Sarvāga is said to have been defeated in a public controversy by the Jain Logician Jaya Śinha Suri (1266 A.D.), author of a commentary on Bhāskarācārya's Nyāya Sara, whose pupil Nāyāchārdra Suri describes this event in his Bhāskarācārya Kāvya. See F. M. Tripolia's Introduction (p. xviii) to Ananda Kumar's Tukūnigrāha (Gauḍikwās Oriental Series, No. III).

100b⁷)* ; this Vādīndra is probably identical with the author of the same name to whom Rasasāra, a Commentary on the second part of the Kiraṇāvali, is attributed (Hall, p 67).

Rāghava was a Śaiva (see fols 19b, 72a b, 100b). His native country is not known for certain, but it seems likely that he was a man of the South. In his Commentary he quotes or refers to the earlier authorities as below

खण्डनमण्डनाः†...4b³,

वात्स्यायन मत 7a⁷

न्यायभाष्यकाराः 8b⁴

मीमांसकाः . }
चार्वाकाः .. } 8b⁵

भूषण, भासर्वज्ञ—11b⁴

चार्चिकरुत्—12b⁶, 20a⁷

तथाचोक्तं—लौकिकी प्रनिभा यद्यत् &c—16a³⁻⁴

तदुक्तं—एकेन तु प्रमाणेन &c—16a⁵

तदाद—यदि पडभिः प्रमाणैः स्यात्—16a⁶

(The above three quotations are from Kumārila's Śloka Vārtika, 4.32, 2.112 & 2.111, pp 143, 80 & 79 of the Chowkhamba Ed.)

तदुक्तं न सोऽस्ति प्रत्ययो छोके &c—18b³⁻⁴

* Cf also the introductory verse in Nyayasāra vichara :

महादेवमह वन्दे गुरु सर्वज्ञमाश्रात् । ग्रन्थपाल्यु षेषित्वे शर्तिदसादभूमम् ॥

Ind. Off Cat., p. 609,

& the verse at the end.

षकार्द्धम्बास पवाप मया ग्रन्थङ्गादिह । वार्दी-द्विति + + कै मात्योऽगविनाम्या ॥

Benares Sk Coll Ms. fol 100b 5-6

† Is this Khandana Maulana identical with the work of Paramānanda existing in the Deccan College Library ? (Cat of Decc College, p. 58).

(From Vākyapadiya, I 124)

यात्तिकार—18b⁴

केचिद् विचक्षणा—19b²

(Apparently this is an ironical reference to an earlier Commentator on Nyāyasāra to whose interpretation Raghava takes serious objection. Thus in Bhāsarvajña's definition of anumāna—सम्यगविनामावेन परोक्षानुभवसाधनमनुमानं—this unnamed annotator tries to establish a syntactical relation between the words सम्यक् and अनुभव which Raghava would not allow.)

Who is the Commentator meant here?

रामभट्टप्रभृतय. 19b³

Rāma Bhaṭṭa was another Commentator on Nyāyasāra whose name and work have been forgotten. In connection with the foregoing definition of anumāna Rāma Bhaṭṭa, as against the view already set forth, prefers to take सम्यक् in relation to the immediately succeeding word, on which Rāghava's criticism follows.

To be Continued.

THE MODERN PERIOD

The School of Mithila

I—GANGEŚA UPĀDHYĀYA

There is no man perhaps in the history of Nyaya Vaiseśika philosophy more frequently heard of on the lips of scholars than Gangeśa or Gangesvara Upādhyaya of Mithila. He gave to this philosophy a new line of development and created for it a new field of work, and for practical purposes, he may be said to have been the father of that form of Nyāya Śāstra with which we are familiar to day. Essentially a keen dialectician and a brilliant controversialist, he made it the sole end of his literary life to make Nyaya Śāstrā a Science of Debate. For this reason he devoted all his energies and intellectual abilities to the task of expounding problems of a methodological and epistemological character. The *Tattvāchintamani* which forms the noblest monument of his genius deals almost exclusively with the Theory of Knowledge and the kindred logical questions (प्रमाण), leaving very little room for pure Metaphysics or Ontology. Even the little theistic tract which has come down to us from his pen is more strictly a work on Anumana Khandā, of which it is expressly stated to form a part than an independent ontological piece.

It is usually believed that it was Gangeśa who for the first time gave to pramaṇa a place of great importance in the Science (& Art) of Debate and inaugurated its studies to the exclusion of every thing else in the schools with a rigour almost unprecedented in the history of modern philosophy. And, further, to Gangeśa is universally ascribed the credit of founding the Neo logic of Eastern India which with its militant dialectics and spirit of analytical criticism has won its way

into every form of intellectual life in the country. That the first of these propositions is unfounded needs no pointing out. For what Gangeśa did for the orthodox system had already been accomplished by the Buddhist and Jain logicians who had preceded him. Dignāga's Pramāṇa samuchchaya, Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇa Vartika and Pramāṇa Vinischaya, Vidyānanda's Pramāṇa parikṣa & Deva Sun's Pramāṇa naya tattvaloka are some of the works on प्रमाण which Gangeśa had before him already in the field. But the second proposition may be accepted, for our notion of Neo logic is bound up with Tattvachintāmāni and the series of Commentaries and subcommentaries upon it but even here it must be remembered that our restriction of 'navya' to Gangeśa is only of a practical value. In the Vidyāvāda section of Śabda Khanda (p 276, Bib Ed) Gangeśa himself refers to the views of Sondada Upadhyaya as those of a modern scholar (नव्यास्तु), thus shewing that the term had already been in vogue even before the days of Gangeśa. The word being only a relative term, it is intelligible why Udayana, Bhāsarvajñā before Gangeśa and Raghunatha, &c after him should have equally been characterised as modern. Nevertheless, in the sense in which we employ the word नव्याय at the present day it refers to Gangeśa and to him alone.

Gangeśa's date is not known with certainty. All that we know about it is that he quotes or refers to the views and statements of his predecessors some of whom he mentions by name. Of these Khandana Kara (i.e. Śri Harṣa, author of Khandana Khaṇḍa Khadya), Jatān Naiyayika (i.e. Jayanta, author of Nyāya Manjari), Maṇḍanachārya (author of Viḍhu viveka) and Śivāditya (author of Saptapadarthi) are admittedly very early, being assigned to periods approximately known. But these render us no help in clearing up the date problem of Gangeśa. The dates of Ratnakośa and

Nyāyalilavati, also quoted in Tattvachintāmaṇi, have not yet been ascertained, though we have found that the author of Nyāyalilavati may tentatively be assigned to the 12th century A D. The only conclusion therefore which the premises justify us in drawing in the present state of our imperfect knowledge is that Gangeśa may be placed somewhere in the 13th century A D.

Regarding his personal history we have no authentic records. There are certain *Hoating* traditions which make him in his early life a blockhead whose ascent to greatness was absolutely an act of Divine Grace.

II VARDHAMANA

Gangeśa was succeeded in Mithilā by his son Vardhamana Upadhyaya who followed in the wake of his illustrious father and kept alive the fire of the New Science which the latter had kindled. In point of scholarship Var ḥamana does not seem to have been in any way less than his great father, and the works which proceeded from him are still universally resorted to as of the highest authority in the subjects concerned. His style is elaborate, but free from verbosity and bathos. He is known to have been the author of the following works —

A Commentaries on

(a) Gotama's

1. Nyāya Sūtras (= अन्योचातत्त्वयोध् or simply तत्त्वयोध्)

The work is of the nature of a gloss and seems to have treated of the whole text. The प्रमेयतत्त्वयोध् to which Ruchidatta and Jayarama refer as the work of Vardhamana

* A Ms of this rare work, dealing with the 3rd chapter, exists in the Govt Sanskrit Library, Benares (New collection of 1917 18, Nyāya section Vestana 9). It is named there अन्योचानयतत्त्वयोध् and not अन्योत्तरयोध्, but as Vardhamana himself refers to it under the second name in his Guga Kirāṇavallīprakāśa we keep it unchanged here.

(Kusumanjali prakasa makaranda Ben Ed., p 5 of Chap 3, cf Aufrecht, Cat Cat I, p 554) and the प्रमाणतत्त्ववोध * also attributed to Vardhamana in Ruchidatta's Commentary on Tattvachintamaṇi (See *The Pāṇḍit*, Old series, VI, p 128) may be only sections of शून्यान्ततत्त्ववोध and no separate treatises.

(b) Udayana's

- i Nyayakusumanjali Prakarana (= कुसुमाञ्जलि प्रकाश)
- ii Kiraṇavali (= किरणावली प्रकाश)
- iii Nyaya Vartika tatparyā parisuddhi (= न्यायविवर्तन प्रकाश)
- iv Nyaya parisiṣṭā (= परिशिष्ट प्रकाश)

(c) Śriharsha's

i Khaṇḍane Khanda Khadya This work was utilised by Pragalbha in writing his own commentary on Śriharsha's treatise Vachaspati II, in his Khandanoddharaṇa, refers to Vardhamana's खण्डनफक्षिकोऽहार which may be identical with it

(d) Vallabha's

- i Nyāyādīvatī (= लीलावती प्रकाश)

and (e) Gangeśa's

- i Tattvachintamaṇi (= चित्ताभाणि प्रकाश)

These are all the works of Vardhamāṇi with which we are acquainted to day. But it is generally believed that Vardhamāṇi also wrote a Commentary on Udayana's Atmatattva-viveka, but the work has since been lost.

We shall not be probably far in the wrong if we place Vardhamāṇi in the first quarter of the 14th Century, but

* While explaining the meaning of the word शाक in Ānumāna-didhiti-शाया चावसरस्य सङ्गात्म वया व्यर्थशाक Bhavaṇauda (Bibl Ed p 12) identifies it with Pramāṇatattvabodha. May it not be Vardhamāṇi's work of the same name?

† Reprint from the Pāṇḍit, p 77

there is no ground in Mr Chakravarti's assertion, repeated by Dr Vidyabhusana (Ind Logic p 455), that he is named by Madhvacharya in the Pāṇinidarsana section of his Sīrvadarśana sūṅgraha The Vārdhamāna, also a Mahopādhyāya, whose name is mentioned in Mithila's work, was a grammarian being the author of Ga varūti Mahodadhi

III—PAKSADHARA / LIAS JAYADEVA MISRA

For a long time after the death of Vārdhamāna there was no thinker in Mithila to preserve, far less to enrich, the new philosophy of the country Supposing that our assumption of Vārdhamāna's date is practically right, we would find that during the long interval of over a century after his age Mithila was without any scholar with any pretension to philosophical renown

By the third quarter of the 15th century was born Pakṣadhara alias Jayadeva Misra to whom we are indebted for the revival of interest in the study of Chintamāṇi In plain truth Pakṣadhara was one of the greatest intellects that modern Mithila has ever produced He was the nephew and pupil* of Hari Misra with whom he had read philosophy and whose memory he gratefully revered in the benedictory verse of his commentary on the Chintamāṇi पितृद्वयहरि-मिथोपदिष्ट ।

He was the author of commentaries on

(a) Śāśadhara's

1 Nyaya siddhantadīpa A Ms of this work exists in the Govt Sanskrit Library Benares

(b) Gangesa's

1 Tattvachintamāṇi (=चित्तमण्यालोक) and

(c) Vārdhamāna's

*In the Navadvīpa mahima p 31, he is described as the pupil of Yajnapati Upādhyāya.

i. Kiraṇāvaliprakāśa
 and ii. Nyāyalilāvatiprakāśa (=लीलाधतीचिदेक)

It may be of interest to note that in the Govt. Sanskrit Library Benares there is a Ms of a commentary, called Tippani, on the Chintamāṇi by Paksadhara—which is different from the Aloka. It is dated Sam 1667.

From a survey of the contemporary literature it seems certain that on its first appearance the Aloka, which formed indeed the best product of Paksadhara's labour, created a great sensation in the world of letters of that time. It was read and taught, admired and criticised in every circle. All parties set themselves to write commentaries upon it. What this general stir was really due to we have no means of knowing. But it is probable that Paksadhara's new interpretation was mainly responsible for it.

From Gangeśa down to Paksadhara Navyanyāya had its sole home in Mithilā. The pandits of that place, who had made it their monopoly & been so long its trusted guardians, took especial care to see that this privilege of teaching the gāstra did not pass away from them into what they perhaps thought unworthy hands*. Students from various parts of India used to flock to Mithilā to draw inspiration from its far famed scholars, and when they completed their studies they returned home with the diploma which their Guru had

* This cautiousness was pushed to its utmost limit. Thus we are told that Ms of Nyāya works which existed in Mithilā, having been left there by their authors, were not allowed to be copied, lest they should be borne away and the prestige of Mithilā for ever destroyed. Students had to commit the texts to memory, and before returning homes had to be very carefully examined by their teachers. It was in this way that the Kārikās of Kusumāñjali were brought to Bengal for the first time, according to tradition, by Haridasa Nyāyalankara (but according to Navadvīpa mahimā, pp 35-36, by Vasudeva Sarvabhauma).

conferred upon them. This diploma was very highly prized, since to secure such a certificate from Mithila, the Centre of the current philosophical thought and activities, was not quite an easy affair. And if a man could once manage to win for himself a diploma of this kind his scholarship was recognised all over the country without a note of grudging criticism.

IV—VĀSUDEVA MĪŚRA

Paksadhara had many pupils of whom Vāsudeva Mīśra, Ruchidattā and Bhagiratha Thākkura in Mithilā and Vāsudeva Sarvabhauma, Raghunatha Śiromāṇi, &c in Bengal, were the most conspicuous.

Vāsudeva Mīśra was Pakṣadhara's brother's son*. When Pakṣadhara's new interpretations were called in question and subjected to severe criticism it was he who came forward to vindicate his uncle's cause and establish his authority†. His commentary on the Tattvacintāmani, known as न्यायसिद्धान्तसार, refers to these overweening captious critics in these terms—

तर्कमधीते सर्वः कति न भयन्तीह पण्डितगमन्या ।

वाचा विचारदक्षा विरला पुनरत्र विद्वांसः ॥

meaning that it is easier to be quibbling and casuistic than to command real wisdom.

V—RUCHIDATTA MĪŚRA

But the most widely known of Paksadhara's pupils was Ruchidatta, popularly called Bhaktu, a native of the village of Sodarapura. His parents were Devadatta and Renukā. He had two brothers named Śaktidatta and Matidatta. Among

* Cf the colophon : इतिथा यायमिदान्तस रामाश्रवर्यपदधरामभ्रान्तपूर्व-
म्यापसिद्धान्तसाराभुव वासुदेवमश्विराचरादा चिन्तामणीशादा &c

Ind Off , no. 786, pp 631-2 ——

† जयदेव गुरोवार्णोच ये कोच्च दोषदर्शिन । प्रबोधाक मया तेषा दीर्घि भूयोऽभिदीप्यते ॥

his works the following three commentaries only can so far be traced these are—

A Commentaries on

(a) Gaugesis

- 1 Tattvachintamani (=चित्तामलिप्रश्नार्थ), referred to in its several sections in (b-1). In this work he speaks of having read the Sastras with several Gurus

and (b) Vardhamana's

- 1 Kusuma jali prakasa (=कुसुमालीप्रकाश) This is a very useful work. Though not a running commentary and quite original it makes an honest and generally successful attempt to make Vardhamana's purport, often hidden and deep beneath the surface, intelligible to the reader
- and ii (Dravya) Kiranavali prakasa (=द्रव्यप्रकाशचिह्निति)
Vide Peterson's Ulwar Catalogue No 606,
p 26 ext no 146, p 53

There is a Ms of this work in the Govt Sanskrit Library dated Samvat 1600 (=1543 A D)

The time when Ruchidatta flourished may be approximately fixed on the following data

(a) There is a Ms of his Makaranda in the Government Sanskrit Library Benares (No 122) which bears the date 423 (आच्छिपक्षतिगम) La Sun, corresponding to the year 1542 A D But as this is the date of transcription of the Ms the author may be set down to some time earlier still they (b) But the time of Ruchidatta is placed beyond all destroyable doubt by a look at the Ms of a copy of Kiranavali returning to himself in the year 386 =रसवसुहरनन्न (It was in the responding to the year 1505 A D *

to Bengal for

*रस तुहानन् चावक शुभजपन्,
Nyayalankara (but .. न्यायाद वृषवार वस्ते चादमये च।
Vasudeva, Samantabhadra)

That this is the true date of Ruchidatta will become apparent when we shall find it synchronising with the age of his contemporary and fellow pupil Bhagiratha Thakkura. The date 1292 Saka (= 1370 A. D.) which appears in a Ms of his Chintāmaṇiprakāśa, as reported by Peterson (Sixth Report, p 76, no 190), is therefore to be taken as a slip of the pen on the part of the scribe.

VI—RAGHUPATI

Raghupati was Mahāmahopādhyāya Ruchidatta's son. He was the author of a Commentary on Tattvachintamani, of which two MSS, one of the Śabda Khanda (शब्दमाण्डपर्वत्ता), dated Sam 1644=1587 A. D.) and the other of the Anumāna Khanda, exist in the Govt Sanskrit Library, Benares.

VII—BHAGIRATHA THAKKURA

Bhagiratha alias Megha Thakkura of Mithilā was also Pakṣadharā's pupil, as already stated. He himself says that he had received his philosophical training under Jayadeva and distinguished himself as a scholar of some renown at the early age of 20*. His parents were Chandra-

विदु तु विनीद कायनो मुमुक्षी-
मक्षिद्वयमक्षिपाणः आरुचि शुभेताम् ॥

(See V. P. Dube's Introduction to *Vaisesika* darsana with *Kiranavali*, p. 28)

* Babu Rajendranath Ghose, in his valuable work on *Navya-Nyaya-Vyaptipanchaka* (Intro p 29), seems inclined to take the sentence विद्याद् ज्यद्वप्तिष्ठानवैतरकान्वयापतः, occurring in Bhagiratha's commentary on Dravyakiranavali prakasha, in the sense that Bhagiratha completed his studies of Jayadeva's works, at the age of 20. He understands कु. with 6th case ending and denies any relation between Jayadeva and Bhagiratha. But it appears to me that though on any construction the sentence would be a faulty one, it would nevertheless yield a better sense if we were to take कु as with 5th case ending. Moreover, Mahesa Thakkura's time being ascertained on other

his works the following three commentaries only can so far be traced : these are—

A. Commentaries on

(a) Gaṅgeśa's

- i. Tattvacintāmani (=चिन्तामणिप्रकाश), referred to, in its several sectors, in (b-i). In this work he speaks of having read the Śāstras with several Gurus

and (b) Vardhamāna's

- i. Kusumāñjali prakāśa (=०मकरन्द). This is a very useful work. Though not a running commentary and quite original it makes an honest and generally successful attempt to make Vardhamāna's purport, often hidden and deep beneath the surface, intelligible to the reader.

and ii. (Dravya) Kiranāvali prakāśa (=द्रव्यप्रकाशविवृति).

Vide Peterson's Ulwar Catalogue, No. 606, p. 26 ; ext. no. 146, p. 53.

There is a Ms of this work in the Govt. Sanskrit Library dated Samvat 1600 (=1543 A. D.).

The time when Ruchidatta flourished may be approximately fixed on the following data:

(a) There is a Ms. of his Makaranda in the Government Sanskrit Library, Benares (No. 122) which bears the date 423 (श्रीकृष्णनिगम) La Sam, corresponding to the year 1542 A. D. But as this is the date of transcription of the Ms. the author may be set down to some time earlier still.

(b) But the time of Ruchidatta is placed beyond all reasonable doubt by a look at the Ms. of a copy of Kiranāvali transcribed by himself in the year 386 = रसवसुहरनेत्र) La Sam corresponding to the year 1505 A. D.*

That this is the true date of Ruchidatta will become apparent when we shall find it synchronising with the age of his contemporary and fellow pupil Bhagiratha Thakkura. The date 1292 Saka (=1370 A. D) which appears in a Ms of his Chintamani-prakasa, as reported by Peterson (Sixth Report, p 76, no 190), is therefore to be taken as a slip of the pen on the part of the scribe.

VI—RAGHUPATI

Raghupati was Mahāmahopadhyāya Ruchidatta's son. He was the author of a Commentary on Tattvachintamaṇi, of which two MSS, one of the Śabda Khanda (शब्दमाण्डपर्वत्ता, dated Sam 1644=1587 A. D) and the other of the Anumana Khanda, exist in the Govt Sanskrit Library, Benares.

VII—BHAGIRATHA THAKKURA

Bhagiratha *alias* Megha Thakkura of Mithila was also Pakṣadhara's pupil, as already stated. He himself says that he had received his philosophical training under Jayadeva and distinguished himself as a scholar of some renown at the early age of 20*. His parents were Chandra

विदु बुधावनाद् कारय नी शुष्टा

म लखद्वयपाणि आराच अ समेषान् ॥

(See V. P. Dube's Introduction to Vaisesika darsana with Kiranavali, p 28)

* Babu Rajendranath Ghose in his valuable work on Navja Nyaya Vyaptipanchika (Intro p 29), seems inclined to take the sentence लियादृ ज्यद्वयाऽऽस्त्रिक्तः एवाप्तु occurring in Bhagiratha's commentary on Dravyakira navali prakasa in the sense that Bhagiratha completed his studies of Jayadeva's works, at the age of 20. He understands कृ with 6th case ending and denies any relation between Jayadeva and Bhagiratha. But it appears to me that though on any construction the sentence would be a faulty one it would nevertheless yield a better sense if we were to take कृ as with 5th case ending. Moreover, Mabesa Thakkura's time being ascertained on other

pati and Dhīrā, and Maheśa Thakkura, of whom we shall speak shortly, was his youngest brother. Among his other brothers we find the names of Mahādeva and Dāmodara mentioned in Maheśa's Darpana. Mahadeva was probably his elder brother and Damodara his immediately younger one *.

We know of the following works of Bhagiratha, viz. Commentaries on—

(a) Vardhamāna s

1. Kīraṇāvalīprakāsa (=कीरणावलीप्रकाशभाष्यप्रकाशिका)
Mss. of this work, dated Saka 1511 (शतिद्युयुत-स्मरवाणच-द्र) or 1588 A.D. and Sam. 1654 or 1597 A.D. are in the Govt. Sanskrit Library, Benares.
- ii. Nyāyakusumāñjali prakāsa (=कुसुमाञ्जलि प्रका-शिका)†

and iii. Nyāyallāvati prakāsat (न्यायलिलावतीप्रकाशिका)

All these commentaries are popularly known under the name of *Jalada*. Bhagiratha is called in a Ms. of his Com. on Lilavati (in Govt. Sk. Library) "Sankara Bhagiratha".

grounds also to be somewhere in the 16th century, the facts would square well if Bhagiratha were placed in the early part of that century and Jayadeva in the middle of the previous century. In Maheśa's time Āloka was a new work. Mr Chakravarti's hypothesis regarding Bhagiratha and Maheśa's date (1400 A. D.) is not very convincing.

* जेहा महादव भगारथी शमोदरा यस्य नयोगुणात्मा॒ । स दर्पण निर्मितात्मं चा उद्गादो विश्वपरा मद्युः ॥ (Anumānālokadarpana by Maheśa Thakkura), Hall (p. 66) and Pt. V P. Dube (Introduction to Tārkikarakṣa, p. 24, f. note 1) are thus wrong in identifying Maheśa with his eldest brother Mahadeva. That Mahadeva was Bhagiratha's elder brother is clearly stated by the latter in his Kusumāñjali Prakāsikā: असादनुपमः +ोऽपि -हदेवः तुलाप्रणी । अनुजस्त्वय कृत्वा निमात्व्य रुपा समीरयः (Ms belonging to Govt Sanskrit Library, Benares—fol. 126 a).

† Both these works are under edition and expected to be published very shortly from the Government Sanskrit Library, Benares.

VIII-MAHEŚA THAKKURA

Mahesa Thakkura was Bhagiratha's younger brother and founder of the present Raj family of Dārbh-ṅgā. He rose into prominence even more quickly than his brother. He was the author of an excellent commentary, called Darpaṇa, on Pakṣadharma's Chintāmanyaloka, which displays his great acumen. One of the main objects of his writing this commentary seems to have been, as in the case of Vasudeva Miśra or Madhusūdana Thakkura, to reclaim Pakṣadharma's renown from hostile attacks. The phrase प्रमधितखलदर्प. as applied to himself in his Darpaṇa, is suggestive.

But it is strange that he did not prosecute his studies with the great Pakṣadharma whose name at that time must have been a household word in Mithila. His brother Bhagiratha had been Pakṣadharma's pupil. What stood in the way of Mahesa then that he was compelled to travel all the way over to Benares and study with a Deccani Pañjīt—Rāmesvara Bhatṭa? It is hard to discover the true cause of this. But two alternative explanations may be suggested.

(a) Either that Pakṣadharma had been recently dead or even if living he must have been too old to hold regular classes,

(b) or that Maheśa's personal predilections for Vedāntic studies led him to come over to Kasi, which had been the principal seat of Vedic culture ever since the days of Śaṅkaracharya or even earlier, and seek instructions with a foreign though far famed scholar.

At any rate his stay in Benares and his pursuit of what I take to be Vedāntic studies had the natural effect of broadening his outlook. His attitude towards Vedānta became tolerant and even respectful, being free from those prejudices which

were a characteristic feature of a *Naiyāyika*'s mind. Thus in the light of what has been said above we are in a better position to understand the meaning of the following statement quoted from Maheśa's commentary (*Anumana* Section): तदेतत् संक्षेपेण वेदान्तिसत् लिखित न दूषितं युतिपुराणस्मृतिशृणुशुश्रृत्यात्। This passage indicates a departure from the custom of the *Nyāya* writer and a leaning towards *Vedanta*.

Maheśa is known from expressions in his work to have been a *Vaisnava* (*विष्णुपर*) in faith, being an earnest votary of the *Balagopāla* form of *Sri Kr̥na*.

The age of Maheśa may be fixed with tolerable certainty. It is well known that he obtained the kingdom of Darbhanga as a free gift from the then reigning ruler of Mithilā (the last descendant of Kameśa's family). As to when this grant was made Mahāmahopadhyaya Haraprasada Sāstrī assigns it to the early part of the 16th century, saying that the Charter was ratified by Sher Shah and Akbar. He further adds that a letter from Maheśa to Raghunatha (composed at Nadia in 1529 A.D.) is found in a Ms of *Vāivasvata Siddhānta* deposited in the Bengal Asiatic Society's Library.* Though this statement is contradicted by the date given for Maheśa's assumption of royalty in the well known inscription on well at Dhanukha in Mithila,† the difference between the two dates is insignificant, and it may be taken for certain that Maheśa belonged to the middle of the 16th Century.

Maheśa seemed to have reigned long. We know of a work named सर्वदेशवृत्तान्तसंग्रह which describes a part of Akbar's reign and was composed in his reign. It is attributed to Maheśa Thakkura‡. If this Maheśa be identical with the author of *Darpana*, as is very likely, he was

* See Indian Antiquary, 1912, p.9

† See V P Dube's Intro. to *Tārikākāksā*

‡ Aufrecht, Cat. Cat I, p. 701; Ind Office, p. 1573

certainly contemporary with Akbar and therefore lived into a part of the latter half of the 16th Century, Akbar's reign having commenced in 1556 A D

IX JIVĀNĀTHA MĪŚRA

Jivanātha was Sankara Misra's uncle, being the elder brother of Bhavanatha. No work by him has yet been discovered, but from the statement in the Upaskara (under Sutra 9 2 1), where his view on the definition of पत्ति * is quoted it appears that Jivanatha left some written works behind him.

X—BHĀVĀNĀTHA MĪŚRA

Dr Ganganatha Jha, in his Preface to the Vādīvinoda, p 2, affirms, obviously on the strength of local tradition, that Bhavanatha, otherwise known as Bube Misra (also known under the nickname Ayāchī) was a great scholar in various subjects etc. His works on Mīmāṃsa and Vyakarana are available, but nothing is known about his Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika treatises, if he had written any.

XI—ŚĀNKARA MĪŚRA

Except perhaps the great Pakādhara, Sankara Misra had few equals in Mithilā since the days of Gangesa. His influence and popularity were immense, and though he was primarily no more than a commentary writer, his services in the cause of the philosophy to which he owned allegiance were assuredly very great.

Regarding his personal history only a few fragments can be gathered. It is believed that he was born in the village of Sarisaba, not far from Darbhanga, where the goddess Siddhesvari enshrined by him is still in existence†.

* द पादसाध्यवत्ता॥न वेनिवर्त्यम् यात्प्राचीन ग्रन्थकथं नवावृच्छाभावं यत् स पत्ति इति जावनायमित्या । This lakshma is also quoted by Sankara in his

† Preface to Dr Ganganatha Jha's edition of Vādīvinoda, p. 2

He is said to have been a precocious child, and anecdotes illustrating his possession of wonderful gifts are still widely current*. The names of his parents appear as Bhavanātha and Bhavāṇi to whom he never fails to pay homage†. If we can place any reliance on Śaṅkara's personal testimony it must be owned that Bhavanātha had been a man of great erudition in almost all his works Śaṅkara acknowledges his deep indebtedness for his interpretation of the texts, especially in their knotty points, to the instructions received from his father ‡. It would seem from words used by Śaṅkara himself that he was taught by Bhavanātha formally who in his turn had been the pupil of his own elder brother Jīvarāṭha§.

Vādi Viñoda p 116-17, [it seems to be a better reading than वादि which is accepted by Dr Jha] There is another reference to Jīvanātha in the Vādīviñodī (p 6121-22).

*Ibid, pp 34

That Sankara was a devoted Śaiva is proved by his benedictory verses (see the introductory verses of the Upas-kāra, of the Līlāvati Kāṇṭhabharana, of the Kāṇḍarahaśyam, of the Vādīvinoda, of the Khaṇḍanatīkā, &c) and by his describing himself as भयाच्छन्नं निरतः (end of Vādīvinoda and of Upaskāra). He was a voluminous writer, being the author of the following philosophical treatises :—

A. Commentaries on

(a) Kanāda's

i. Vaiśeṣika Sūtras (उपस्कार) Sankara's introductory verse (3) seems to imply that in interpreting the construction of the Sūtras he had no predecessors for his guidance or support. It was, he says, like the hazardous enterprise of a daring acrobat (खल) who attempts at walking in the mid-air on the nominal support of a piece of thread :

सूत्रमात्रावलम्बेन निरालम्बेऽपि गच्छतः ।

खे खेलवन्ममाप्यत्र साहसं सिद्धिमेष्यति ॥

Here the words सूत्रमात्रावलम्बेन and निरालम्बे would seem to suggest that in Sankara's time no direct gloss on the Sutras was extant.

रवमातुर्जीवन् यस्य व्याह्यामास्यादवान् माय ।

मात्पता भद्राण्यो मा तामिद्वाश्चिरवृत्तमान् ॥ fol 165b

The Śloka also occurs in the printed text of Sankara's Commentary on the Khaṇḍana Khaṇḍa Khādyā (Lazarus & Co. Benares, 1888, p. 732), where the name Jivanātha is replaced by Jayanatha; but it does not appear in the MS. No. 134, dated Samvat 1529, belonging to the Government Sanskrit Library, Benares. The statement, however, plainly shows that Sankara reproduced in his works, at any rate in the Commentary on the Līlāvati, what had been dictated to him by his father according to the teaching of his uncle, and that consequently he should not be held directly responsible for the views therein expressed.

Now, if this suggestion were true what are we to say of the *Vṛtti* to which Śankara himself makes such constant references (*Upaskāra*, under *Sutras* 1.1.2; 1.2.3, 6; 4.1.7; 9.2.13 &c)? Possibly to maintain his consistency we shall have to fall back on the only other alternative that the *Vṛtti* from which he quotes had not been, like the *Bhāṣya* itself, an immediate interpretation of the *Sūtras*.

The following authorities are referred to in the *Upaskāra*:

- { प्रशस्तदेवाचार्याः—1.1.8, 4.1.2, 8.2.3, 9.2.8
- { प्रशस्तदेवगादाः—9.2.6
- { प्रशस्ताचार्याः—9.2.13, 10.1.1
- { प्रशस्तदेवाः—9.1.10
- { वृत्तिकार—1.2.3, 6.1.12, 9.2.8
- { शूक्लिकृत—1.1.2, 1.2.6; 4.1.7, 7.1.3; 9.2.13; 10.1.3
- { उच्योतकराचार्याः—1.2.5
- { न्यायवार्तिक—9.1.1
- कीर्ति—(धर्मकीर्ति) 8.1.2
- दिङ्गनाग—8.1.2
- भूषण—7.2.1
- क्षीतातिकाः—7.2.20
- पदार्थ प्रदेश, (?)—9.2.6
- श्रीधराचार्याः—7.2.8
- उदयनाचार्याः—7.2.8
- घङ्गभाचार्याः—4.1.10

The *Upaskāra* appears to have been composed at Benares.
—Cf the sentence दद्यते चेह वाराणस्यां &c under *Sūt.* 7.1.22.

- (b) Pragastapāda's
- 1. Padarthadharmaśamgraha (कणादरहस्यम्), referred to in the *Upaskāra* (7.1.6.). It reads more like an independent treatise than a commentary, and had it not been for the

intimation by the author himself that it is a "Vyakhyā" * it would never have been possible to class it under commentaries. No *pratikas* from the original are given for the guidance of the reader and usually the order of the *Bhāṣya* too is not followed.

(c) Udayana's

- i Atmatattvaviveka (आत्मतत्त्वविवेककल्पलता)
- ii Nyāya Kusumāñjali (आमोद) † In the third introductory verse of this book the author refers to three previous commentaries, viz Makaranda, Prakāsa and Parimala‡

*See Kanada rahasyam, p 1 (Chow. Ed) • द्रष्टुष्टमंतायांन्य-
विशेषमप्यत्त्वायाना पदार्थाना तत्त्वशास्त्रं नि अद्यसहस्रितं प्रश्नात्पादाधार्यमात्पत्त्वाहयाऽच्छेन
कथादरहस्यं वाख्यास्यानः ।

†Aufrecht, Oxf Cat , p 243, No 601. Though the name of the Commentator does not occur here, there cannot be any question about Sankara's authorship of the work. The verse—मवार्त्तामृतायांन्या
पितृभ्या प्रप्तमध्यहस्य— and the expression—ततोऽपि॒ । १५तुव्याख्याः । स्वातुमयम्—
prove the fact beyond any shadow of doubt. There is no ground therefore for attributing this Commentary to Ramabhadra Sarvabhauma (*Sub Voce*). The Ms of Amoda, which exists in the Govt. Sanskrit Library Benares (fols 1-116), calls itself in the colophon the work of Sankara Misra.

‡The verse runs

मकरन्दे प्रकाशं या वाख्या परिमेऽप्यवा ।
ततोऽपि॒ का पितृव्याख्यामात्पत्त्वातुमयम् ॥

(Mr Chakravarti's reading of the Sloka (J A S B , Sept , 1915, p. 281) is manifestly corrupt). Aufrecht's Latin interpretation of this stanza, as given in the oxford Catalogue, is hopelessly inaccurate. Putting aside for the moment the identity of Makaranda which might for aught we know appear to be the well known work by Ruchidatta (though there is every reason to question this

iii. Trisūtrā nibandha (त्रिसूत्रीनियन्धव्याख्या). Sankara mentions here (Intro. Verse 2) the existence of three excellent commentaries on Udayana's nibandha, viz. Prakāsa, Darpana and Uddyota and adds that his own attempt is rather to bring out the plain meaning of the text. Thus we have प्रकाशदर्शणोदयोत् (not प्रकृ as in the Notices) त्रिसूत्राख्या कुतोऽवदशः । तथापि योऽनामात्रमुद्दिष्याऽपि समोदयम् ॥

Sāstrī's Notices, III. No 136 pp. 88, 89. It is clear that the three Commentaries named in the above sloka were all on Udayana's Trisūtrā nibandha—the work on which Sankara just proposes to comment. Of them Prakāsa is undoubtedly the Nyāyanibandhaprakasa of Vardhamāna, but the remaining two are unknown. The identifications which Mr. Chakravarti (*loc. cit.*, p. 269) suggests for these Commentaries will never hold (a) The Prakāsa can in no wise be supposed to be the work of Ruchidatta, (i) because Ruchidatta was a later writer (La. Sam 386 = 1505 A.D.) than Sankara Misra

any Commentary on the Nyaya-nibandha. His Prakasa is a Commentary on Gangeśa's Tattva Chintamani, and *not* on the Nyaya-nibandha to which Sankara alludes (b c). Similarly, the Darpana and the Uddyota could not have been the respective works of Mahesa Thakkura and Vahinipati, for the double reason (i) that they are not Commentaries on the Nibandha (but on Pukṣadharī's Alola) and (ii) that both Mahesa (1548 A D) and Vahinipati (later than the date of Vasudevi Sarvabhuwana) were Sankara Misra's successors and not predecessors.

(d) Śrīharas

- 1. Khandana Khandī Khadya (आनन्दवद्धन) [A Ms. of this work (fols 1—118) on palmleaf and in early Bengali script, exists in the private library of a gentleman at Benares. It bears the date in Lakshmana Era 423 i.e. 1542 A D. The colophon runs thus इति महामहोमिथथीशुङ्क रठनप्रथमखण्ड खण्डबाद्यानन्दवद्धनं समाप्त मिति । द्वरनेत्रपक्षवेदैर्लक्ष्मणसमर्पयते । शिवाचानि रत स्वार्थ श्रीमान् यधरोऽलिखत् ।]

(e) Vallabhacharyas

- 1. Nyayalilavati¹ (न्यायलीलावतीकण्ठाभरणम्)

(f) Gangeśas

- 1. Tattva Chintamani (चिन्तामणिमयूख) It is referred to in the Upaskara (3 1 14, 17, 3 2 18, 7 2 20, 26+) and the Vadivinoda, p. 59

B (e) गणितिनोद, an original treatise on the Science of Dialectics, referred to in the Upaskara (9 2 2)

(b) भेदरक्षप्रकाश*. The main object of this book was to reclaim the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika dualism from the attacks of Vedānta. And as this could not possibly be accomplished without in the first instance overthrowing the position already gained by Śrīharṣa in the Schools the work turns out practically to be a refutation of Khaṇḍana Khaṇḍa Khadya itself. Though Śaṅkara, by commenting on the Khaṇḍana, appears to have been in sympathy with Vedānta, his real attitude towards it was always hostile.

Sankara's time may be thus calculated. There is a Ms. of his Commentary on the Khaṇḍana Khaṇḍa Khadya in the Government Sanskrit Library, Benares which

* This seems to me to have been the full designation of the work, which appears in R. L Mitra's Bikaner Catalogue (p. 539, Ms No. 1148). It is also called simply Bhedaprakāśa, as by the author in the Vādīvinoda (p. 44) or as in Hall's Bibliographical Index (p. 85) or simply Bhedarakāṇa as in Jha's Introduction to the Vādīvinoda (p. 4).

Aufrecht (Cat. Cat. I, p. 416) says that this book (Bhedaprakāśa) was "reproved in Saṅksepa Śāṅkaka 2, 1." Leaving aside the question how a book written in the 15th Century could have been noticed in a work decidedly several hundred years earlier, I cannot make out how Dr. Aufrecht discovered the name of a book at all in the sloka above referred to. The sloka is reproduced below :

एव समन्वयनिरपेक्षाऽदवेषे,
जातोऽस्यदविष्यो भनु यावदजन्मः ।
मानान्तरेण दरिपूर्वित एव जाते।
भेदप्रकाशनहृतान्तिव्यवस्थेन ॥

Probably the phrase here underlined made Dr. Aufrecht suspect it to be the title of a book !! It is strange how Dr. Satis Chandra could have accepted this blunder in his *Indian Logic*, p. 459 !

bears Samvat 1529 (=1472 A.D.) as the date of its transcription. Hall saw (p. 85) a copy of Bhedaprakāśa dated 1519 of the Vikrama Era (=1462 A.D.)*. This supplies the lower limit of Śankara's age. The other limit however may be taken to be the time of Vardhamana Upādhyāya whose Commentary on the Kusumāñjali is referred to in Śankara's own Commentary, Amoda. Thus it is highly probable, as Mr Chakravarti holds, that Śankara flourished about the second quarter of the 15th Century †. And this date of Śankara would be in full agreement with the tradition that he was a contemporary of Vāchaspatti Miśra II and Pakṣadhara Miśra‡.

* This Ms. is now deposited in the Raghunath Temple Library of His Highness the Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir. The date is thus entered . शत्रु १५१६ सम्ये चेत् शुद्धे २५ पूर्णिमा महालिङ्गे । [It is significant that the oldest MSS of Śankara's works, so far brought to light, were both written at Benares—(a) the Khandanatika in the Benares Library in 1472 A.D. by one Vasudeva, a native of Bengal and (b) the Bhedaprakāśa in 1462 A.D. by one Kāyatītha Surya Dasa (see Stein, Jammu Catalogue, p. 328)?]

† Dr. Ganganatha Jha, in his Preface to the Vācīvindā, pp. 1-2, places Śankara about Samvat 1585. But in view of the positive evidence adduced above it is no longer possible to accept this date as true.

‡ Cf the verse

संकारचारपत्यो द्वावाचारपती भवतः ।
वाचस्पतिपत्यो लक्ष्मीभूति न च क्वापि ॥

(Quoted in the Preface to Khandanoddhara, p. 3) Most probably the first two names Śankara and Vāchaspatti are to be understood as directly intended for Śankaracharya and Vāchaspatti Miśra, the great champions of Vedanta, and not merely for Śiva and Bṛhaspati, and the point of the saying would then consist in the popular estimate that as Śankaracharya and Vāchaspatti were masters of Vedanta, in the same way Śankara Miśra and Vāchaspatti II occupied a unique position in Nyāya-Vaisesika.

VII- VACHASPATI MISRA II

Sankara Misra's younger contemporary was Vachaspati Misra II. Vardhamana in his introduction to Dandaviveka calls himself the pupil of these two scholars*, and according to tradition also Sankara Vachaspati and Pakshidhara were all contemporaries †.

Vachaspati was the Court Pandit of Rajas Bhairavendra alias Harinavava Deva and his son Rupanaraya alias Ramabhadra Deva of Mithili and lived about the middle of the 11th Century †.

He wrote mainly on Hindu Law, but he was also a good Naiayika. The following philosophical works attributed to him display closeness of reasoning and great original powers

A Commentaries on

(a) Gautamis

i. Nyaya Sutras (=न्यायतत्त्वालोक)

and (b) Gangeas

i. Pittvachintamani

B (a) Nyayasutroddhara. This booklet was intended to determine the number and true readings of the genuine sutras as distinguished from those which have been interpolated into the text from time to time. This work is therefore, in its object, of a similar nature with its predecessor, the Nyaya sachi nibandhi of Vachaspati Misra I. It

* Sankara Misra and Vachaspati Misra II (and Ganadeva Misra) were the gurus of the Sitala Vardhamana the contemporary of R. Bhairavendra. Cf Danaviveka As Soc AS p 1, verse 6 —

वदायान् गृह्णक रस रक्तुराम पदा च मुग्रव ।

† रक्तुरामपदो मरणा नामा मृष्टि ।

४३ सप्तरथा रक्तुराम च श्वार ॥

principal interest however consists in the fact that it represents the Maithila recension of the Satrapaḥa

(b) Khaṇḍanoddhara This is a rejoinder to the objections brought forward by Śrīhara in his famous polemical treatise against the dualistic hypotheses of the Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika schools of thought. Though certainly the work does not rise up to the high level of Śrīhara's masterpiece it is nevertheless an interesting study, as showing how cleverly the Naiyāyika brushes aside the charges of his opponents.

We have seen above that Sankara Miśra too was a firm dualist and that his Bhedaratnoprakāśa was an attempt on the part of an advocate of realism made in defence of his realistic convictions. It was Śrīkara's no less than Vachaspati's religious instinct which impelled them to employ their pen against the authority of Śrīhara's masterly treatise. The controversy on the Vedānta side was resumed at a later date by Madhusūdana Sarasvatī whose Advaitaratnarakṣa is a scholarly reply to Śrīkara's Bhedaratna. But Vachaspati's Khaṇḍanoddhara seems to have been left neglected by the Vedāntists.

XIII — MADHUSŪDANA THAKKURA

It has been observed that the Tattvachintamāni and more especially its Commentary, the Aloki by Pakṣedhara, were very seriously attacked on their first appearance, and that in consequence of this it became the fashion of the commentators to take upon themselves, in addition to the usual work of interpretation, the further task of defending the text. Madhusodana's claim to distinction, like that of the predecessor Vāsudeva Miśra, rests on the successful

accomplishment of a self imposed task of a similar kind
In fact, his commentaries are all of the nature of defence

Madhusudana was a Mathila Brahmana His age is still undetermined but I feel strongly inclined to place him in the last quarter of the 15th Century or in the first of the 16th Having commented on Vachaspati II's Dvaitanirnaya*, he must have been later than the middle of the 15th Century But Mr Chakravarti's surmise that he lived in the third quarter of the 16th century (J A S B Sept 1915, p 271) is hardly tenable His conclusion is apparently based upon the evidence of a Ms of Kāntikoddhāra transcribed in La Samvat 491, but this is of no weight as against the positive testimony of another Ms of the same work copied 32 years earlier in La Samvat 459 (See Mitra's Notices, No 1909, Vol V, p 225) or 1578 A D

His Nyāya works are commentaries on

(a) Gangeśas

i Tattvachintāmāṇi (करण्टकोद्धार) This is known through Burnell's entry only (Tanjore Catalogue, p 115 b), but is otherwise unknown It is possible that on examination it will prove to be a commentary on the Aloka

& (b) Pakṣadhara s

i Tattva Chintāmāṇīloka (करण्टफोद्धार or पक्ष-परोद्धार as in Hall, p. 39) This is really his main

* This Commentary is known as वाणिदा See Mitra's Notices, No 1853 (Vol V p 1.6) where the Colophon is thus given इति महामहोपाध्याय श्रीमद्बुद्धेन्द्रियाद्युपर्को उत्तरपर्कं याद्यार स७४ ।

† It may be pointed out here that there exists in the Government Sanskrit Library, Benares, a Ms of Kāntikoddhāra dated samvat 1667 (-1600 A D)——a date which is practically identical

work, in which he describes himself as a master of Mimāṃsā and Nyāya (मीमांसान्यायपारगेत्)*

It is probably to this work that Visvesvara Sūti refers in his Vyākaraṇa Siddhānta Sudhanidhi (Chowkh: Ed., pp 58, 69). The *Sabda Khaṇḍa* of his Commentary, of which a Ms. in two sub sections (marked here as *A* and *B*) exists in the Govt. Sanskrit Library, Benares, is found to contain the following references:

Section A :—

- | |
|---|
| <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: top; width: 40%;">वर्धमानवचन 2 a⁴</div> <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: top; width: 40%;">..5!</div> |
| <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: top; width: 40%;">वर्धमानोपाद्याय वचन</div> <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: top; width: 40%;"></div> |
| <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: top; width: 40%;">अनुमान कण्ठकोद्धार (his own)</div> <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: top; width: 40%;"></div> |
| <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: top; width: 40%;">प्राभाकराः 28b⁴</div> <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: top; width: 40%;"></div> |
| <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: top; width: 40%;">अर्द्धचीताः 34b¹</div> <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: top; width: 40%;"></div> |
| <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: top; width: 40%;">प्राचीताः 34 b⁸</div> <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: top; width: 40%;"></div> |
| <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: top; width: 40%;">शीफरमत 39 a⁹</div> <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: top; width: 40%;"></div> |
| <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: top; width: 40%;">किरणावली (कालग्रन्थ) 42 b⁴</div> <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: top; width: 40%;"></div> |
| <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: top; width: 40%;">नव्याः 45 b⁶, 60 b¹</div> <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: top; width: 40%;"></div> |
| <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: top; width: 40%;">महार्णववद्सेश्वरौ 46 b¹¹</div> <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: top; width: 40%;"></div> |
| <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: top; width: 40%;">दुर्गटीका 58 a¹</div> <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: top; width: 40%;"></div> |
| <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: top; width: 40%;">महार्णव 58 b¹¹, 59 a⁶</div> <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: top; width: 40%;"></div> |
| <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: top; width: 40%;">दूरदत्त 60 b⁶ (The following verses are quoted from Haradatta)</div> <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: top; width: 40%;"></div> |

उक्तं च दूरदत्तेन—

अनिदं प्रथमाः शब्दाः साधवः परिकोर्चिताः ।
 त एव शक्तिवैकल्यप्रमादालसतादिभिः ॥
 अन्यथा विवृताः पुंभिरपश्वदा उदीरिताः ।
 स्मारयन्तश्च ते साधूनर्थधीर्हेतवः स्मृताः ॥

* See Ind. Off. Cat., p. 629.

Section B.—

कुसुमाङ्गलि ३८^b

नव्या ३८ a³

उपाध्यायः ३८ a¹⁰, ४८ a¹⁰ b¹

XIV.—DEVANATHA THAKKURA

Devanātha is known to have written a supplement (*परिचय*) to Pakṣadhara's Aloka (including notes on the original text of Gangeśa). He was a Śāva (See the Intro-
versel) and probably a pupil of Govinda*. A Ms. of this work,
as noticed by Mm Hara Prasada Śāstri (Notices, Vol III, p
74), was transcribed by one Rāghava at the instruction of the
author himself and bears the date in La Samvat 443 or 1562
A. D.t. Thus Devanātha's time falls in the middle of the
16th Century.

XV—GOPINATHA THAKKURA

He was the son of the Maithila Thakkura Mahāmabopādhyāya Bhavanātha of the Goghota family, and a Vaiśvata
of the Bindāvana school of faith. He is known to have
written only two works on Nyāya, viz.—

A. A Commentary on

(a) Keśava Miśra's

‘ Tarkabhāṣā ’ (तर्कसापाभाषप्रकाशिका), in
which he quotes or alludes to the views of
मणिकूट—fols 7b¹¹, 20 a¹⁰, 22b¹², 23a⁸;
पक्षघरमिश्या—fols 7b¹⁸, 23a¹ 12;

* इ से ४४३ तेर वदि एका न्या चन्द्र महामहाठवकुर मादनत्रयमहाशुद्धाशुणालेख
राघवेन लिखितम्।

^t Thus we read the end introductory verse of the Commentary:

देवनायेन गोविन्दवराणाम्बुद्धेनिना ।

चिन्त्यामणी वदाक्षोदै परिशेष ततुच्छते ॥

Who was this Govinda? Could he have been the well-known
author of Kāvya-pradīpa, a Commentary on the Kāvya-prakāśa?

रक्षकोद्यकारः—fol. 23b⁴;

मिथा:—fol. 23b⁶,

उपाध्यायाः—fol. 23a¹⁰(1)

and B (a) चिन्तामणिसार or simply मणिसार (2)

It contains an abstract of the exposition of the fundamental concepts of Chintāmāni and may be held to be either a synoptic Commentary on the text or an independent work on the basis of it. Aufrecht is wrong in attributing it to Gopinātha Miśra (Cat Cat I 217), for the author of the Commentary on Tarkabhāṣa himself affirms that मणिसार is his own composition.

Cf. इति प्रतिपादितं (प्रपञ्चतं) मणिसारे—

-fol. 13a⁸, 13b⁶⁷, 14a³¹⁰, 29a¹ (Benares Sanskrit Library Ms.).

Gopinātha's time is later than Gaurikanta who refers to him in his Bhāvarthadīpikā. He may have lived therefore in the 16th Century (end).

(1) The leaves are of the Benares Sanskrit Ms. Library.

(2) The Anumana section of this work has been edited by Pandit T. Ganapati Sastri and published in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series (No. XXIV), 1914.

To be Continued

'Vairasenicharita,' 'Bhaumibharti-charitra,' &c., has one point common to them all, and that is the word 'charita' or 'charitra', which defines the character of the work and classes it under a 'charita kavya' (biographic or historical poem). Or, if, on the strength of arguments to be adduced hereafter one questions, as one may, the authority of the concluding verses which, evidently, are no parts of the subject of the poem, we have another, an indisputable one, in the mention of the Naṣadha (meaning this same poem as is

काव्य चाहणि नैपथ्यचरित सर्गो निसर्गोऽज्ज्वलः ॥ (IX)
 तकेऽवसमश्मस्य दशस्तत्स्य व्यरंसान्महा-
 काव्ये चाहणि नैपथ्यचरिते सर्गो निसर्गोऽज्ज्वलः ॥ (X)
 शङ्कारामृतदीपगावयमगांडकादशस्तन्महा-
 काव्ये चाहणि नैपथ्यचरिते सर्गो निसर्गोऽज्ज्वलः ॥ (XI)
 तस्य द्वादशा एष मातृच-जाम्भोजालिमीर्णमहा-
 काव्येऽव्यग्रहस्य चरिते सर्गो निसर्गोऽज्ज्वलः ॥ (XII)
 स्वादूतादभूति त्रयोदशतयादेश्यस्तर्णये महा-
 काव्येऽव्यग्रहस्य चरिते सर्गो रसाम्भोनिधिः ॥ (XIII)
 यातहस्य चतुर्दशः दशदिवज्योत्स्नान्द्यस्त्रै महा-
 काव्ये चाहणि नैपथ्यचरिते सर्गो निसर्गोऽज्ज्वलः ॥ (XIV)
 यातः पञ्चदशः कुर्वेतस्तस्त्रादाविहायं महा-
 काव्ये तस्य कृतौ नलीयचरिते सर्गो निसर्गोऽज्ज्वलः ॥ (XV)
 काश्मीरमेंहिते चतुर्दशतर्णी विद्यां विशिञ्जिमहा-
 काव्ये तदभूति नैपथ्यचरिते सर्गोऽज्ञामस्त्पोऽङ्गः ॥ (XVI)
 यातः सप्तदशः स्वसुः सुपदविषि चिठ्ठमप्रशास्त्रमेंहा-
 काव्ये तदभूति नैपथ्यचरिते सर्गो निसर्गोऽज्ज्वलः ॥ (XVII)
 यातोऽमिन् यिपश्चक्षिसिद्धिभगिर्णासौआव्रभव्ये महा-
 काव्ये तस्य कृतौ नलीयचरिते सर्गोऽव्यमष्टादशः ॥ (XVIII)
 एषामत्त्वज्ञतो नवार्थगटनामेकाद्विविनो महा-
 काव्ये रस्य कृतौ नलीयचरिते सर्गोऽव्यमित्त्वगात् ॥ (XIX)
 अन्याक्षुणग-सप्तमेऽभणितो विगस्तर्णये महा-
 काव्येऽव्यग्रहस्य चरिते सर्गो निसर्गोऽज्ज्वलः ॥ (XX)
 तस्यरागा इत्यमेविगगगनः दावाऽतिभव्ये कृतौ
 भमोऽपूर्वरितवर्णतमये सर्गो निसर्गोऽज्ज्वलः ॥ (XXI)
 इविद्वान्नमसाहमादङ्गिते चम्पकृतोऽये महा-
 काव्ये तस्य कृतौ नलीयचरिते सर्गो निसर्गोऽज्ज्वलः ॥ (XXII)

clear from the context) by this same term in the body of a second work by the same author, the Khaṇḍana-Kharḍa-Khaṇḍya (2). That the two books—the Naṣṭadha and the Khaṇḍana—are by the same author is borne out by the use of the first person (अहम्) in the text of the Khaṇḍana referred to above, and the same indirect reference to Panini by दाक्षीपुत्र in the Naṣṭadha (3) and by दाक्षिनःदन in the Khaṇḍana (4), disregarding the concluding verse of the 6th canto (on the ground referred to above) and the concluding verse of the book as it stands (5) (on the ground of its falling under the same category with the concluding verses of the cantos, as will be fully discussed later on), though both of them, the former directly by its mention of the Khaṇḍana as another work by Śrīharṣa and the latter indirectly by its recurrence at the end of the Khaṇḍana also,—point to the same common authorship. Thus, then, it is clear that the Naṣṭadha is a biographic poem. By a biographic poem we mean, and naturally, one that records, if not all, at least the leading events in the life of its hero or heroine. What of this kind do we find in the Naṣṭadha? There only one principal event—the wedlock with its preliminaries—occupying the early life of the hero exhausts the whole subject. The eventful after-

(2) तथा इम कथये नवपचरि १८४ पाः मधुलास्तुतो स्तो—ch १)

(3) दाक्षीपुत्रस्य रन्ये भुग्मयमभवत् कोट्यर्थीती स्पोतः।

एष्ट दाक्षीपुत्रसिद्धिक्षतश्चक्टिर्णेष्टभूपानुषातः।

सर्वं गिर्मूलय देवान् स्तुतिमुग्मि गतां घोषयन् यो पुष्टजाः

श्रावक सम्भारेण सम्प्रत्यपि भुवति दिः १६४ काण्ठमेन ॥ (XIX, 61)

(4) अन्यथा दाक्षीनन्दनोर्दीरितवशामज्ञात्यभिज्ञायां पाथः प्राप्यमाकः वानन-
स्पत्यामलीषाभिमानी भवानांहृत । ch 1)

(5) वान्मूर्त्यमासनं प लभते यः कान्मूर्त्येष्वात्

यः साक्षात् दुर्लेख समाप्तिपुर पर यद्य प्रमाणान्वयम् ।

स्तुतात्य समुर्गर्पि धर्मितपरामृतं कुप्यान्त्य

धीर्धीर्पन्नेः एवि एविमुद्रं वस्त्रान्तुर्विषयादिरम् ॥

to which of these was the real Nala) had already begun his torment on the fair Damayanti (6). Here the poet has given a forecast of Kali's persecution on Nala. In XVI. 57 our poet in describing the knotting of the garments of the married couple says —The all knowing Priest then knotted the garment of the Vidarbha princess with that of her beloved, communicating in the act, as it were, the infidelity of Nala who would afterwards cut off her garment and run away (7) Here we are told how Kali in the guise of a bird would divest Nala

life of Nala (as we deduce from the Mahābhārata on which our poet has drawn for his subject) has been completely ignored. Even the scriptural injunction which prescribes marriage for progeny (पुत्रार्थं क्रियते भाग्यीः) has been disrespected. The Hindu scripture, which only cou tiously assigns an equal place to conjugal sport (राते) with progeny (पुत्र) in the line (रतिपुत्रफला नारी) can hardly tolerate this outrage which allots the whole portion to राति and leaves none for the पुत्र. The poet's license has hardly a plea in the present case. For, however acute it may be, it cannot transgress the bounds of propriety. If close following of the original was never the intention of the poet, it was open to him to devise new events to give consistency to his poem. Silence is absolutely unwarranted. To suppose that no notable events characterised the life of the hero is grotesque in itself. Thus, it is the title itself that establishes the incompleteness of the poem, and the same has been amplified by numerous forecasts—mostly on the line of the original, the Mahabharata—in the book. Consistency of these places would be at stake if a continuation of the Naisadha were not admitted. For, a poet's hero is an independent creation. To understand him we must resort to his own work, and no extraneous source. Even in a case of complete likeness in character between the hero of a poem and his prototype, it would be an unnatural procedure to understand one for the other. Hence, the Naisadha alone is competent for the solution of points raised in the Naisadha. The Mahabharata is perfectly foreign in this matter. I shall now refer to those exact places where our poet has given forecasts of his hero's after-life. In XIII. 37 where Damayanti on seeing five persons of the appearance of Nala cannot come to a decision, the poet describes her then perplexity in the following terms —Nala's persecution by Kali was yet to come ; but Dvāpara (i. e. the doubt as

to which of these was the real Nala) had already begun his torment on the fair Damayanti (6). Here the poet has given a forecast of Kali's persecution on Nala. In XVI. 37 our poet in describing the knotting of the garments of the married couple says —The all-knowing Priest then knotted the garment of the Vidarbha princess with that of her beloved, communicating in the act, as it were, the infidelity of Nala who would afterwards cut off her garment and run away (7) Here we are told how Kali in the guise of a bird would divest Nala of his garment, and how Nala would clothe himself in a half piece cut off from the garments of Damayanti and abscond Again, in XVII. 14, in the poet's use of the term **अक्षविनय** (where **अक्ष** means both dice and the senses) (8) we find an allusion to the fatal play at dice. But these are only covert allusions, and our poet has gone even farther. He has brought on the stage the root cause of all mischiefs—Kali, in person, made him pronounce his stern resolution—I shall completely subjugate him, shall strip him of both his land and Damayanti' (9), set him on his journey for the execution of his resolve (10), escorted him to Nala's kingdom and to his capital (11), and

(6) कारिष्यते परिभवः कलिना नलस्य
तां द्वापरस्तु दुतनूमदुनोद् पुरस्तात् । (XIII.37)

(7) प्रियांशुकृपान्धिनिषद्वाससं तदा पुरोधा विष्णे विद्मजाम् ।
जगाद् विचित्र्य पटं प्रयाह्यतो नलादविश्वासमिवेष विधवित् ॥ (XVI.37)

(8) अद्वाकुराजिहानं ते स्मरमप्यसर छाण् ।
अथाविनयशिक्षायं कलिनेव पुरस्कृतम् ॥ (XVII.14)

(9) प्रतिष्ठय नले विज्ञाः कलेविज्ञायती मम ।
तेन भैर्मी च भूमि च त्वाजयामि जयामि तम् ॥ (XVII.138)

(10) द्वापरैकपरीवारः कर्लिमत्सरमूर्च्छितः ।
नलनिशादिर्णा यानां जगाद् यहिलं किल ॥ (XVII.159)

(11) मण्डलं निष्पेन्द्रस्य चन्द्रल्येवामलं कलि ।
प्राप मडापथितुं पाप. स्वभांतुरिव संग्रहात् ॥

life of Nala (as we deduce from the Mahābhārata on which our poet has drawn for his subject) has been completely ignored. Even the scriptural injunction which prescribes marriage for progeny (पुत्रार्थं क्रियते भाग्योऽहम्) has been disrespected. The Hindu scripture, which only con teously assigns an equal place to conjugal sport (रस्ते) with progeny (पुत्र) in the line (रस्तेपुत्रफला नारी) can hardly tolerate this outrage which allots the whole portion to रस्ते and leaves none for the पुत्र. The poet's license has hardly a plea in the present case. For, however acute it may be, it cannot transgress the bounds of propriety. If close following of the original was never the intention of the poet, it was open to him to devise new events to give consistency to his poem. Silence is absolutely unwarranted. To suppose that no notable events characterised the life of the hero is grotesque in itself. Thus, it is the title itself that establishes the incompleteness of the poem, and the same has been amplified by numerous forecasts—mostly on the line of the original, the Mahabharata—in the book. Consistency of these places would be at stake if a continuation of the Naisadha were not admitted. For, a poet's hero is an independent creation. To understand him we must resort to his own work, and no extraneous source. Even in a case of complete likeness in character between the hero of a poem and his prototype, it would be an unnatural procedure to understand one for the other. Hence, the Naisadha alone is competent for the solution of points raised in the Naisadha. The Mahabharata is perfectly foreign in this matter. I shall now refer to those exact places where our poet has given forecasts of his hero's after life. In XIII. 37 where Damayanti on seeing five persons of the appearance of Nala cannot come to a decision, the poet describes her then perplexity in the following terms —Nala's persecution by Kali was yet to come ; but Dr̄apara (i e the doubt as

to which of these was the real Nala) had already begun his torment on the fair Damayanti (6) Here the poet has given a forecast of Kali's persecution on Nala In XVI 37 our poet in describing the knotting of the garments of the married couple says —The all knowing Priest then knotted the garment of the Vidarbha princess with that of her beloved, communicating in the act, as it were, the infidelity of Nala who would afterwards cut off her garment and run away (7) Here we are told how Kali in the guise of a bird would divest Nala of his garment, and how Nala would clothe himself in a half piece cut off from the garments of Damayanti and abscond Again, in XVII 14, in the poet's use of the term अक्षयिनय (where अक्ष means both dice and the senses) (8) we find an allusion to the fatal play at dice But these are only covert allusions, and our poet has gone even farther He has brought on the stage the root cause of all mischiefs—Kali, in person, made him pronounce his stern resolution—I shall completely subjugate him, shall strip him of both his land and Damayanti' (9), set him on his journey for the execution of his resolve (10), escorted him to Nala's kingdom and to his capital (11), and

(6) कारिष्यते परिभव कलिना नष्टस्य

ता द्वापरस्तु उत्तनूमदुनोत् पुरस्वत् । (VIII 37)

(7) प्रियाशुक्रप्रियनिषद्वासस वदा उरोधा विद्येषं विद्मजाम् ।

जगाद् विच्छिय पट प्रयास्यतो नवादविशासमिवेष विश्ववित् ॥ (XVI.37)

(8) अद्वायुराजिहान ते स्मरमप्येषर या ।

अधायिनयशिक्षाधं कलिनेव पुरम्ळृतम् ॥ (VIII 14)

(9) प्रतिद्य नडे विना कलेविज्ञायता मम ।

तेन भैर्मा च नूर्मि च त्वावया मि जपामि तम् ॥ (XVII.138)

(10) द्वापरैकरीगर कलिमस्त्वामूर्च्छित ।

नलनिषादिर्णा या ना जगाह प्रहिल किल ॥ (VIII 159)

(11) मण्डल गिष्पेन्द्रस्य चन्द्रस्येवामल कलि ।

प्राप म्तापयितु पाप स्वभावुरिव सप्तदार् ॥

having lodged him secure on a bibhitaka tree in the garden adjoining his palace placed him an expectant for an opportunity for his persecution (12). With all this preparation, when the time comes for its fruition, the poet says a good-bye. How is this to be justified? In this connection let us also have a peep into the character of the boons which the gods respectively grant the couple. Indra gives his boon (to Nala)—‘For your residence a town will be built in your name near Benares on the other side of the Asi’ (13). Agni gives his (to Nala)—‘My energy which is conserved for cookery will be at your disposal (14). Yama gives his (also to Nala)—‘Even when badly situated, your mind will not swerve from virtue (15). Varuṇa gives his (also to Nala)—‘Water will become manifest wherever you will wish it, even though the place may happen to be a dry land’ (16); ‘also, by contact with your body, fading will not come over a flower and fragrance will be preserved’ (17). Their joint boon to Damayanti is—‘You are amazed to see how we cast off our disguise and resumed our native forms. You too by our grace will acquire the same power of assuming forms at pleasure’ (18). Now where, one may ask, is the consistency of this introduction of boons in the poem? The author of the Mahabharata has shown its denouement in the episode

कियतापि च कालेन कालः कलिरूपयिवान् ।

भैर्भुर्तुरहस्यार्णा राजधार्मा मर्हासुजः ॥ (XVII.161-2)

(12) त्रमादम्बनमासाच वैद्यमीनिपवयायो ।

कलुणे कलिरन्विष्वन्नवार्त्साद् वत्सान् व्रह्म ॥ (XVII.217)

(13) तबोपचाराणसि नामचिद्दं वासाय पारेऽसि पुरं पुराणित । (XIV.74)

(14) या दात्पाकौपयिकी तनुम् भूयास्त्वदिच्छावशवर्विनी सा । (XIV.77)

(15) कृच्छ्रं गतस्यापि दग्धविपाक धर्मान्न चेतः स्त्रलतु त्वदीयम् । (XIV.81)

(16) यथाभिलाङ्गस्तव रत्रौ देशे नन्वस्तु धन्वन्त्यपि तृण्मणं । (XIV.83)

(17) अम्लानिमोदभरश्च दिव्यः पुष्पेषु भूयाद् भवदङ्गसङ्गात् । (XIV.85)

(18) कृटग्रायमग्नाय नो वपुर्विभ्रतस्त्वमसि वीक्ष्य विहितवा ।

भाष्टुभाकृतिमतो मर्नापितां विद्या हृदि तवाप्युदीयताम् ॥ (XIV.94)

of Damayanti's second Svayamvara. But nowhere in the character of either his hero or his heroine has the author of the Naisadha shown it in his poem. Should it be said that the reader of the Naisadha will supply the omission from the Mahābhārata, that cannot be, the two, as we have remarked before, being entirely distinct from the standpoint of each other. Even admitting for argument's sake, that such license is permissible, how are we to explain those cases where the author has deviated from the Mahabhbārata? The conclusion, therefore, is inevitable that the current Naisadha is incomplete. But here a question may arise that if the current Naisadha is incomplete how are we to explain the presence of the four verses appended at the end of the poem (19)? The plain answer to this is that the verses are spurious. Why we say so may be shown thus. First, one great discrepancy that staggers one at the outset in the verses is that the author has been designated in two of these (verses 1&3) by the first person, in one (verse 2) by suggestion, and in one (verse 4) by the direct mention of his name. Secondly, the style of the verses, if carefully examined, would strike one with the idea that they are not all of the same hand or of the same period. The stamp of a raw hand is also at places clearly manifest,

(19) (a) यथा यूनहतद्वप्तरमरमणीयापि रमणी

कुमाराणामन्त छणहरण नैव कुरते ।

मदुक्षिवेदन्तमद्यति स्थीभूय हृषिय

किमस्त नाम स्यादासपुरुपा नादरभरे ॥

(b) दिशि दिशि गिरिप्रावाण स्त्रा वमन्तु सास्वर्ती

तुलयतु मिथस्तामा पातस्कुरदृश्वनिडम्बराम् ।

स परमपर क्षीरोदन्वान् यर्दीयमुदीयते

मधितुरमृतं संदच्छेदि प्रमोदनमोदनम् ॥

(c) ग्रन्थप्रनियरिह कचिन् कचिदपि न्यासि प्रयत्नान्मया

प्राज्ञमन्यमना हटन पठिती मारिमन् खल देवतु ।

अद्वाराद्वगुरुर्धीकृद्वदप्रनिय समाप्ताद्य-

त्वेतत्काव्य सोमिमज्जनसुख्यासम्भन सज्जन ॥

(d) See footnote (4)

for example in the expression यत् अर्थः in verse 1. Thirdly, from the tenor of verses 1 & 3 it would appear that the poem did not find favour with a certain class of readers and of the utterances which were probably the cause of this disfavour is it of explanation has been attempted in the verses. For nobody on the present, of a possible interpretation of his book will likely have his own discursive tongue to turn the fan and thus make a reality Iversus, as such fact seems to be the effect of mutual his pp. as a previously experienced in respect of other works of the author the usual is not fully justified. Hence it is probable that some successor writer—an admirer of our poet—mortified at the unmerited disparagement of his idol has disturbed his feeling in the above way. Fourthly extreme self conceit has found expression in the second verse. It soot is ungraceful when coumin, in the form of self approbation. Such self conceit has found expression in two other places also—the concluding verses of cantos 8 and 20—which also should therefore be construed in the same way as this. Fifthly, the fourth verse (as also the third) also appears at the end of the author's Kha; Juna—khaya khadya. Until therefore, from other works of the author, it is definitely known that the same has been the procedure invariably adopted by him, we may safely take it that this (as also the preceding) has its right place in the Khanda, having under the mistaken notion that the book had ended there, been subsequently appended to the Ni-sadha. The same remark in a slightly modified form applies also to the first two verses viz., those too had their right place elsewhere, and it seems likely, for in those too there is nothing to show that they are exclusively meant for the Narakadha. Or, the spuriousness of the fourth verse can be shown in another way also. The verse is autobiographic in character. In this and also in affinity of style, it tanks with the concluding verses of the cantos

About the concluding verses, in spite of their historical value, one feels constrained to believe that they are not genuine, or synchronous with the production of the *Naisadha*. The following are our grounds for the above belief.—

(i) The monotonous repetition at the end of each canto like the recurrence of the drop scene after each act of a play is most repulsive, and yet not indispensable like that other. The concert of a new element here and there is far too weak to remove that repellishness. That the same master poet, who has evinced wonderful command over the realm of thought in his *Pancha-Nali* (a set of verses popularly so called, being equally applicable to the real and the pseudo-Nalas) and at several places to the same thought has presented a well devised variation of expressions, should exhibit such a poor stock of thoughts and expressions in the lexicon of his resources, is a thing hardly conceivable. (ii) In the concluding verse of Canto 16 which alludes to the appreciation of the poem by the scholars of Kashmir we meet with a discrepancy that hardly admits of a solution. The poem is yet in the embryo, for only sixteen cantos have been finished, yet there is the appreciation declaring the poem as an accomplished thing already. Even admitting, though such admission is prohibited by the third case ending in काश्मीर, that the अस्ति कृ signifies the present time, we are no safer. The whole Kāvya is not there, only a portion of it. If, again, on the precedence of the use in the Bhagwadgītā (I 9)—अन्ये च वद्यते शुरा मदर्थं त्यक्तजीविता—we attempt to explain the अस्ति as expressive of future, we shall be landing ourselves on a fresh inconsistency. For, there the fate of the accounted heroes—though future—is as sure as the past. The same is not the case with the fate of the poem. For, the honour that claims record in a book is never an easy thing to gain. Chances of failure are quite possible. To seek

a solution in the supposition that the statement might be possible on the appreciation of the portion already finished would involve in the first place an error of expression, and in the second an error of judgment (iii) Both the Naṣadha and the Khaṇḍana have in each a reference to the other (vide the concluding verse of Canto 6 and footnote (2)) which is another way of saying that the same in one place is anterior and in another posterior with respect to the other Bhagavatāchārya, editor of the Khaṇḍana, not finding a solution of this riddle felt constrained to conclude the simultaneous production of the two books—a curious conclusion for a scholar on a book of philosophy We in plain terms shall simply class the concluding verse as spurious

The above conclusion in no way detracts from the historic importance of the concluding verses For, though no genuine products of the author, nor synchronous with the production of the Naṣadha, they may yet have been composed subsequently by his son, pupil, or any other responsible person

After such elaborate discussion no one will raise the question of bulk (I mean of the book) to disturb our conclusion Yet that too has a reply In the science of poetics there is no maximum limit prescribed for the number of cantos as none for the number of verses in each canto, and there even exists a poem named Haravijaya with as many as fifty cantos

If a continuation of the Naṣadha is admitted, we must either say that the sequel is lost, or that the poet could not finish the book But when we look into two facts it is well nigh clear that the book was finished one, the mention of the Naṣadha in the Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhaṇḍya (see footnote (2)), and the other, the appreciation of the Naṣadha by scholars in Kashmir (Vide the concluding verse of Canto 16) For, by the first, though the priority of the Naṣadha up only to the end of the 21st Canto (which forms the subject of

the psalm referred to there) is conclusively proved, yet it would be too much to suppose that the author could think of leaving his book unfinished at an advanced stage reaching up to the close of Canto 22 (up to which it is available) and beginning another so different in character and so stiff and bulky as the Khaṇḍanakhanda. As for the second, the appreciation of a *Mahākāvya* is not possible when there is only a portion of it (viz 22 Cantos) there. For, besides poesy, it requires character sketch correlation of the parts, and many other things for consideration. This, therefore is our final conclusion that the sequel also was written, but is now lost, and this is probable too for, a good many of our poet's works—whose names we find—are lost to day.

In connection with the above conclusion of mine I may casually remark that, in my solicitude to learn whether tradition lent any support to my view I referred the matter to many of my friends and acquaintances, and, among them, to Pandit Ramagopal Smṛtibhu ḥaṇḍa of Benares, whereupon the last gentleman emphatically supported my view and said that many years back he had witnessed with his own eyes a manuscript of the sequel in Unia character with an Unia pupil of his—named either Damodar or Rudranarayan (he did not recollect which). He also quoted two verses (one in full and the other in part) belonging, he said, to the same. The verses are —

(1) घदान्ति ये चम्द्रमसं सुया॑ स न पीपते तै किमु नायिकाधरम् ।
सुरापगाभीर्य॑ (?) पिवजनेन किं रसचर॑ (?) नारधिनोरमुच्यते॥

(2) ३सुद्गृह्णतनपर्वताद्वयतरद्वृते द्वारायतो रोमालि श्रतिवद्यते ॥

The late revered Mahamahopadhyaya Rakhaladasa Nyayaratna too is reported to have used to quote a half verse which, he said, belonged to the Naṭyadha, but is not found in the twenty two cantos current of the poem. The half verse referred to is this —

सस्मार सस्मरमना प्रियदृतभूत तदामरालयमरालमरालकेशी ।

I now come to the second part of my treatise.

In the auto biographic verses (I mean the concluding verses of the cantos and the concluding verse of the poem as a whole) we find mention of the poet's parents, his works, his realisation of the Chintāmani mantra his honour at the court of the King of Kanouj, and many other things. But nowhere do we find any mention of his native country. Yet there are evidences in abundance in the book which go unmistakably to show that his native land was Bengal. Those evidences are presented one by one, before our readers.

The first evidence is the mention of the 'ululu' (a peculiar sound produced by the tongue, resorted to by women on festive occasions). The poet has introduced it in connection with the Svayamvara of Damayanti. The context is —When Damayanti offered to place the garland on the shoulders of Nala, the characteristic festive song, inarticulate with ecstasy, came out as the sound of 'ululu' from the mouth of the ladies of the harem (20). Now, every body knows that the 'ululu', though extended as a thing to Assam and Orissa as well, is, as a name, confined to Bengal alone. The same finds corroboration in Narayana's comment —'The name 'ululu' is used in Gauda for a class of festive songs indulged in on festive occasions like marriage &c.'—where Gauda in the opinions of the experts is Bengal. Mallinatha's interpretation of the term, though slightly diverging from Narayana's, viz he has termed it a custom of the north, also, when we view it from his own country—the south, points to the same conclusion, at least in part.

(20) कापि षमादास्तुटनिर्जिहानवग्र या मङ्गलगीतिरासाम् ।

सेवाननेभ्यु गुहन्दराणासुचलद्युष्मनि च चार ॥ XIV 51)

(21) विशाहाद्यूष्मने खीगा धवलादिमहालगीतिविगेषो गौडेने 'उल्लु'

इत्युपर्यं ।—Narayana

Experience also tells us that, excepting Assam, Bengal & Orissa, nowhere else in North India is this practice to be met with. There too, the union of the name and the thing, as observed above, is peculiar to Bengal alone.

The second evidence is the use of the conch bangle. This too as the writer has come to learn from his investigation, is characteristic of Bengal alone. 'The conch bangle and vermillion' is a common saying for an unwidowed woman in Bengal. The connection in which it finds mention in the Naradha is this 'The bride's arms, united with auspicious conch bangles, appeared as if they were being attended upon by fresh grown lotus stalks for acquiring tenderness from them' (23) That this practice of wearing conch bangles is current only in Gauda or Bengal finds support also from Narayana whose words are—'गौडेशे विद्युक्ताने शङ्खचलय-धारणमाचार' (The wearing of conch bangles by the bride at marriage is a practice prevalent in Gauda) Just as the wearing of conch bangles characterises the beginning of married life, so does the breaking of them characterise the beginning of widowhood. The poet has referred to this second point also in connection with his description of a certain king (the king of Kanchi) who attended the Svayamvara, as follows—'Swans in the shape of his glories carrying off lotus stalks in the shape of conch bangles breaking on the hands of the youthful consorts of the rival heroes, sport in fountains of the tears of the same wives of his enemies (24)

(22) उन्मुरितवस्तु रक्षिद्वयगत्सक एव्याजार्थो ध्वनिवर्णेण उत्सवादी स्त्रीभिर-
दयायत इत्पुरीच्यानामाचार ।—Mallinatha

(See V P Dube's Introduction to Vaishika Darshana with (Kiraṇavalli 28))

(23) उगस्यमानाविव शिक्षितु ततो मृदुत्स्वमप्रोद्भूषणलभालया ।
विरेत्तुमाहुलिकन सहृतो भुजा ए त्या वलयेन कस्तुन ॥ (XV 45)

(24) अद समित्पम्मुख्यार्थो गतुटद्भुजा कस्तुमृणालहारिणा ।
द्विप्रहर्षम्येगद्वगम्युनिहर यशोमालाक्षिरिवास्य गेलति ॥ (XII. 35)

The third evidence is the tying of the hands of the bridegroom and the bride with a kuśa blade at marriage. This is no scriptural injunction, but a usage (25), prevalent in Bengal, and, so far as I have been able to learn from investigation, in Bengal only. The poet has introduced this in the Naisadha in the following connection —‘The hand of the bridegroom is a delighter in homicide (i.e. in war), while that of the bride is a stealer of the lustre of a lotus (being equally beautiful). Is it for this reason that in the well governed Vidarbha kingdom these two (a murderer and a thief) were bound with stiff kuśa ?’ (26)

Now if, as we have seen, the three customs above alluded to are not found in the country (Vidarbha or Naisadha) in relation to which they have been introduced, are we justified in inferring that these are the customs of the poet’s own country ? Nārayaṇa too in his comment on the ‘ulūlu’ expressed the same opinion, namely, that the poet has alluded to the custom of his own country (स्वदेशरीतिः कथिनोक्ता ।). If so, then think what that country should be. Should it not be the same country of Gauda or Bengal, where the three customs unite ?

Besides the three places indicated above, the poet has in many other places followed the customs of Bengal or his own country. Such are—(i) The painting of the floors and walls of a house with the pigment of rice powder on festive occasions (27) (ii) The wearing of a crest and the holding of a mirror by the bridegroom while starting on the marriage procession (28) (iii) The entrance of the married

(25) ‘कुद्रौ पाणिद्वन्मै देशाचारः ।’ Narayana,

(26) परस्प पाणि परधात्सौतुकी वधूकर पश्चमगान्तितहकरः ।

सुआङ्गि तौ तथ्र विद्यमण्डिते उत्तो निश्चौ फिसु कंडो तुक्षे ॥ (XVI. 14)

(27) कचित्तदालेपनदाम अऽता कमप्यः इकारमगात्पुल्कता । (XV, 12)

(28) भनर्ध्यत्त्वौघमयेन मण्डितो राजा सुकृदेन मूर्गनि । (XV 60)

couple into a room specially designed for the occasion, in which they are to pass the night in company with their friends (29) (ii) Niceties of fish and flesh in marriage feast (XVI 76, 81, 82, 87) &c These customs, individual speaking, are more or less to be found in other parts of India as well, but collectively they are the specialities of Bengal alone. The nicely of fish and flesh is a notable feature of Bengal. Excepting Kishmir, nowhere else in India does a fish meal constitute a prominent part of a banquet like Bengal. 'Fish and rice' is a by-word with the Bengali, and the same has its exact counterpart in our poet's 'शूष्मीन' (XIV 78). Again, vermillion is a close associate of the hair parting of a married woman (whose husband is living) in Bengal, and our poet's predilection for this custom of Bengal has led him to introduce the thing even in Vidarbha where saffron is current. In the act he has not sacrificed consistency, having shown it not in the gynaecium of Vidarbha itself, but in the bevy of the royal consorts who had been invited to the wedding. The connection is this — When the royal consorts who had come to attend the nuptials bowed at the feet of Damayanti with the express intention of winning her intercession against chances of widowhood at the hands of Nala, the lac of her feet appeared on their heads like auspicious vermillion for the longevity of their husbands (30). That saffron is current or profusely used in Vidarbha may be gathered from our poet's own words. In one place he says—“where the large tank infused with the saffron

पने समस्तापयनावलम्बिना विभूपञ्चाना मणिमण्डल नल ॥

स्वरुपरखामवलाक्ष्य निष्ठलीचमार सेवाचगदंपगापंगम् ॥ (XV 70)

(29) स कोतुङ्गारभगात् पुराण्यमि सहजरन्ध्रीहृतमीक्षिद्वितत ॥ (XVI, 46)

(30) नक्षात्स्वैवेष्ट्यमवानुमानत् तृपद्वियो भाममहोत्सवागत ।

तदृग्निलाक्षामदधन्त मद्वल तिर ए सिन्हरमिर द्रियावुपे ॥ (XX. 55)

coming from the beautiful ladies while bathing does not, like an unbesmeared woman clear up by the whole night' (31) In another—where at every sunset the saffron shops shone like the rays of the sunk down sun having tarried on earth (32)

With regard to the above customs one may urge that there is no knowing that they were current in Bengal even at the time of our poet To this our answer is that the customs of a family or of a country do not change easily Their authority is higher than even that of the scriptures For illustration look at the history of the present age and you will see how in the midst of innumerable adverse circumstances the ancient beliefs are still clinging to the people's mind While the assembly hall is resonant with the cheers of equality, the seraglio is carefully guarding its own individuality The predominance of local customs finds support in Śriharṣa too The following extract from Narayana's commentary will bear testimony to this—अत्र कचित् कचिद् विधिकमभद्रो देशः चाराच्छुताख्यभेदा त्कुखाचारविशेषाद् वा वोद्धव्य । न पुन श्रीहर्षकवेरद्वानलेश्वोऽपि । (Wherever in this marriage concern scriptural injunctions will be seen to have been violated, this should be explained as having been done out of regard for usage (of the family or the country) or revelation In no way is it a mark of the ignorance of the poet Śriharṣa) From this same we are also to conclude that the customs of other countries too were very nearly the same at the time of our author as they are to day

Here a question may arise that, if the customs were the same even before, how are we to justify the two Vedic uses

(31) उद्धोगनमज्जनापितृसूर्यं व्र कथायिताशया ।

‘ न निशाचिलयापि धापिका प्रसराद् ग्रहिण य मानिनो ॥ (II 77)

(32) रवयोऽस्तमितस्य भास्त्रत स्वलिता य निमालया किल ।

‘ अनुसायमभुविलेपवापणकाश्मीरजपण्यर्थाथप ॥ (II 90)

'उलुलय' (with its variant 'उलुलय') (33) and उलूलचः (34)? For these undoubtedly are the prototypes of our modern 'उलूल' and as such they prove, along with its antiquity its diffusiveness also. Apart from the Vedic uses in a comparatively modern poem too we find reference to the ululu (35). The author is a Gujrati which means that the custom was in vogue in Gujrat as well in ancient times. As for the conch bangle too, from its reference in the Mahabharata (36), as also in the Kadambui (37) it is well nigh clear that the practice was in vogue in other countries as well and not confined to Bengal.

In reply, we should take the cases individually. With regard to the two Vedic uses 'उलुलय' (with its variant 'उलुलय') and उलूलच we should first consider whether they conform to our ululu. For, simply because there is sameness in expression, we are not necessarily to conclude that there is sameness in meaning as well. The same word very often

(33) उद्वर्षना मवभूवाजिनान्युद्गाराणा जयतामप घाप ।

पृथग घोपा उलुलय कतुमन्त उदीरता

देया इन्द्रजयेष्टा महो यन्तु मन् ॥ (Atharva Veda III. iii. 1 (6)

(34) अथ यत्तद्जाग्त साऽसागदित्यम्त जायमान घापा उलूलवोऽनूतिष्ठन्त सर्वाणि च भूतानि सब उ कामास्तस्मात्स्यादय प्रति प्रत्यादन प्रति घापा उलूलवोऽनूतिष्ठन्ति सवाणि च भूतानि सब चेव कामा । Chhandogya—III. 19 (3)

(35) ह्रूपाभिस्तु तुरङ्गाणा वाणाना किञ्चरम ।

रथानामपि चात्कारमुंचास्फोटसुआनृताम् ॥

सरनाना पदपद्मवान रुदूवास्तदक्षुपम् ।

सद्गुचक्षति तस्थाभूच्छ्रुण्डैतमय चगत् ॥ (Juga luchanita)

(36) पिद्वृक्षु पाणिभ्या तृतीया प्रहृति गत ।

यणीकृतशिरा राजन्नाना चर तृहृत्वा ॥ (Virata 2. 27)

अथापरोऽदृशत रूपमनादा खागमक्षरं गता तृहृतुमान् ।

— प्राकारवप्त प्रतिसुखकुण्डल दाय च रुदूपरि हाटे शुभं ॥ (Virata 11. 1)

(37) इमकर्मभाद्वौरभुक्तगतित म स्वताभुवलताविगलित शहृवलयस्ति
मृणालशकै कलमापितम् (आध्रममरम्यम्)

is found to convey widely divergent meanings, and a philologist in such cases of divergency of meanings will not even admit the sameness of the word. So long, therefore, as we shall not find concordance of both word and meaning in the instances, we cannot admit their application to the present case. So let us see the extent of that concordance in the two cases. The 'उल्लुलयः' (with its variant उल्लुलयः) finds mention in a hymn of the Atharva Veda. It relates to warfare. The heroes are going to the war. The priest is offering his invocation for their victory. The meaning of the hymn is this — 'O Indra, let our heroes by your grace be inspired with warlike spirit, the warcry of the triumphant heroes rise deafening the ears of the enemies, the quarters resound with loud shouts of 'ullulu', the gods headed by Indra (ourselves) come to our help in the fight'. From what we get from the meaning of the hymn, we cannot class this 'ullulu' and our 'ulalu' under the same category. The 'उल्लुलु' is a mild auspicious sound peculiar to the gynaecium; the उल्लुलु is a wild ecstatic shout peculiar to the battle field. Though ecstasy and auspiciousness are both inherent in both, yet in one they are primary, and in the other secondary (respectively taken). This double character of the 'ulalu' as primary and secondary in its two aspects respectively understood finds expression also in the particular sloka of our poet. (The use of उल्लुलु throughout in this topic for उल्लुलिं or उल्लुलिं in the readings उल्लुलय and उल्लुलयः of the text is in accordance with Sayana) (38). Now to उल्लुलयः. This occurs in the Chhandogya Upanisad. The context is this; "When the sun had his birth, simultaneously therewith arose acclamations, as also all beings and all desires. Therefore, (even to-day) at his rising and also setting (or reappearing), arise acclamations, as also all beings and all desires."—

(38) 'उष्टुलय इति । अनुकरणशब्दोऽयम् । उल्लुलु इत्येवभात्मकाः'—Sayana

Sankaracharya According to Śaṅkara उलूलचः = उरुरच = acclamatory, that is, he, in consonance with the dictum—'र and ल are identical'—read उरु for उलु (उलूलु = उलु + उलु = उरु + उरु = उरुरु), and construed the word as an adjective to वोपा, and though by the remark as follows the birth of the first son of the lord has apparently admitted the two aspects (ecstasy and auspiciousness) of the उलूलु, yet by his attaching the alternative meaning of 'setting to प्रत्यायन has also partially discarded them For where in 'rise' there is the suggestion of birth, in 'decline that of death is inevitable Hence what at one place has been prescribed because of its festive and auspicious character cannot, on the worldly stand point, be justified at the other unless stripped of that character Even omitting the alternative meaning of 'setting', the word 'उलूलच' as taken by Śaṅkara cannot be admitted as suggestive of the 'ululu which is purely of an onomatopoeic character Truly speaking, the 'उलूलु' in question is completely unsuitable in the present case, for, at the first appearance of the sun, the absence of creation necessarily involves absence of the sound in question, and even after, nobody ever uses the 'उलूलु' at sunrise, at sunset never By this Ānandagiri's interpretation of the word directly referring to our उलूलु (for he explains it as 'a peculiar acclamation on festive occasions confined to particular countries' which is clearly a periphrasis for उलूलु) is also discarded

The reference in the 'Jagalucharita —the modern poem spoken of before—is this 'When his (Jaglu Shah's) party started (on pilgrimage), the neighings of horses, the trumpetings of elephants, the rattlings of chariots, the arm slaps of the strong armed, the panegyrics of bards and the 'ulala' sounds of the fur eyed, all contributed to turn the whole atmosphere into one of sound alone Heie with all deference to the

author's knowledge of the thing 'उलूल', we are constrained to say that he was not fully informed about its application For, nowhere in the parts of India where the practice of उलूल is current, is it used on occasions of pilgrimage This short coming only shows that the author's information was second hand Or, even admitting that the practice was prevalent in Gujerat at the time of either the author or his hero it cannot affect our position until we meet with an exact parallel to the case we meet with in the Nai adha and even then the other evidences that have been adduced will run counter

Now for the conch bangle The connection in which it finds mention in the Mahabharata is this The Pandavas having settled that they should pass the year of their incognito life in the city of Virata are now coming to an agreement as to how each should pass that life Yudhiṣṭhīra and Bhūma having communicated their own modes, Arjuna communicates his — I shall introduce myself as a eunuch named Brihannala, and, concealing the bow string marks on the arms with bangles, wearing ear rings and conch bangles and tying the hair into a braid, shall thus in the guise of a woman teach music to the queens and also amuse the hearts of the king and the ladies with tales Thus I shall live incognito Should the king ask my antecedents I shall say that I was formerly an attendant of Draupadi in the house of Yudhiṣṭhīra.' After that Draupadi, Nakula and Sahadeva declared theirs in their turns All the six it should be known, emphasised their former connection with Yudhiṣṭhīra as their common master This done, the whole party prepared themselves for entering Virata Here one may naturally think that conch bangles were current at that time in Virata and other allied places So we shall see whether any solution is possible of this In the opinion of experts the name Virata or Matsya applies also to a part of Bengal (viz the districts of Dinajpur Rangpur and Cooch Behar jointly taken) and the acceptance of that view would

solve the question very easily and from the standpoint of distance that would indeed be very favourable to a life of concealment, for considering the importance of this life on the success of which rested the future of the Pandavas, the safer such life would be the better. But from the separate mention of Vaugha and Virata in the description of the princes assembled at the Rajasuya of Yudhiṣṭhīra in the Mahabharata (39), and the geographical situation of the country of Matsya (40) mentioned in connection with the incognito life, it is clear that Matsya or Virata is distinct from Bengal and located somewhere in the north west of India. Therefore the solution of the question should be sought elsewhere. In the consultation above referred to we find that the five brothers and Draupadi all come to the agreement that if asked by the king of Virata they would each say that they formerly served under Yudhiṣṭhīra and would also describe the nature of their service. The object of mentioning Yudhiṣṭhīra is that if known to be complete strangers Virata would not admit them in his house, and the name of Yudhiṣṭhīra carried with it not only a removal of that bar, but also his sympathy, for, they knew that king Virata was loyal to the Pandavas (41), and for this reason particularly they sought the shelter of Virata. In the above connection with Yudhiṣṭhīra they want to show that they are not residents of Virata, and they do not also want manifestly to show that they belong to the country of Yudhiṣṭhīra. If so the object of wearing

(39) पौष्ट्रको वासद्वयश्च वङ्ग कालिन्दकर्मतया ।

•

•

•

विष्णु सह पुत्राभ्या मागद्युध मद्यायठ ॥ (Sabha 34 11-2)

(40) उत्तरण दशार्जास्ते पञ्चालान् दशिष्ठेत तु ।

उत्तरण पहुँचोमान् शूरसेनाध्य पाण्डवा ।

लुभ्वा दुयाणा भत्त्वपस्य विषय प्राविशन् वनात् ॥ (Virata 5)

(41) मल्ट्यो विराटो यलवानभिरकोऽध पाण्डवान् ।

धंसीरा घदान्यश्च वृद्धश्च सतत प्रिय ॥ (Virata I-16)

the conch bangle is to show their alien connection, and thus Bengal also may come This is possible, and desirable too,—possible, because Arjuna, while out on pilgrimage wandered through many countries and in the course of his wanderings went to Bengal also (42), and was acquainted with the practices of the place,—desirable, because by creating the impression of a distant residence it would greatly contribute to the security of the disguised life, or, a combination of the practices of two distinct provinces, such as a bunch of bangles on the arm and conch bangles on the wrists, through a vagueness about residence, would the more strengthen that contribution A side question also is possible here, and that is—If the conch bangle were not current in Virata, how could Arjuna procure it there ? To this we reply—The matter is not directly opposed to the principle of commerce, nor is there any justification for the belief that conch artisans were scarce in a flourishing city like Virata. Further, it would not be an unreasonable supposition that in consequence of the extreme hardness of the incognito life, the subject was uppermost in the mind of the Pandavas and they had long been preparing themselves for it

The place of the Kedambari is the picture of a hermitage The connection of conch bangles there is this ‘In the hermitage here and there were lying morsels of lotus stalks half swallowed by young elephants, which gave one the impression that they were conch bangles slipped out of the hands of Goddess Sarasvati’ —(The Parrot’s speech). For the all-white Sarasvati such an ornament—the conch bangle—is most suited and natural. So the poet’s conception in that respect is very nice indeed. But side by side with this an element of distaste also is there. That is the poet’s ascription of slipping (from the hand) to the conch bangle. For, the

(42) भद्रवद्वर्किंगुयु यानि तीर्थानि कानिचित् ।

जगाम तानि सर्वांगि पुण्यान्यायततानि च ॥ Adiparva 215- 9)

conch bangle is never worn in a way that would make slipping possible. Then, there is always associated with the conch bangle an idea of auspiciousness that urged the author of the Naisadha to introduce in the abundance of jewelled bangles the bangle of conch. From the afore said conception of slipping as also from the suggestion of a broken condition to be supplied from the context the idea of auspiciousness has suffered with the result that the attainments of the hermits which dictated the introduction of Sarasvati in the hermitage have been negatived by the allied conception of her widowhood. Should one attempt a justification by construing it as a part of the उत्त्रेष्टा, it would not stand. For the potency of the उत्त्रेष्टा has been exhausted in the ascription of the material conch bangle to the spiritual Sarasvati. Hence, it is clear that even admitting the prevalence of the conch bangle in Bana Bhāṭṭa's time (7th century A.D.) in his country (Bengal) it was certainly not in the way in which we find it introduced in the Naisadha. The latter is typically Bengali. Next, in consideration of Bana Bhāṭṭa's extensive travels (for which his own admission in the Harsacharita is the authority) and the peculiar association of Sarasvati and conch bangles with Bengal, it would not be unfair to connect his introduction of the conch bangle with the influence of his acquaintance (however imperfect) with Bengal. Or, this may have been influenced by the Mahabharata. Thus our position is unaffected from first to last, and our poet (Śrīhara) was not only an inhabitant of the country of conch bangles, but was also conversant with the art, as evidenced in the following extract —

ताराशङ्कविलोपकस्य जलजं तीक्ष्णत्विपो भिन्दत
सासम्बन्धता करेण निविडां निष्पीडनां लम्भत ।
क्षेदाधौं पहुताम्बुजम्बुजरजोजम्बालपारदूभव
च्छुद्धित्वकरपवतामिह घदघस्तं गतोऽधर्थं विधु ॥(XIX 57)

the conch bangle is to show their alien connection, and thus Bengal also may come This is possible, and desirable too,—possible, because Arjuna, while out on pilgrimage wandered through many countries and in the course of his wanderings went to Bengal also (42) and was acquainted with the practices of the place —desirable, because by creating the impression of a distant residence it would greatly contribute to the security of the disguised life, or, a combination of the practices of two distinct provinces, such as a bunch of bangles on the arm and conch bangles on the wrists, through vagueress about residence, would the more strengthen that contribution A side question also is possible here, and that is—If the conch bangle were not current in Virāṭa, how could Arjuna procure it there ? To this we reply—The matter is not directly opposed to the principle of commerce, nor is there any justification for the belief that conch artisans were scarce in a flourishing city like Virāṭa Further, it would not be an unreasonable supposition that in consequence of the extreme hardness of the incognito life, the subject was uppermost in the mind of the Pāṇḍavas and they had long been preparing themselves for it

conch bangle is never worn in a way that would make slipping possible. Then, there is always associated with the conch bangle an idea of auspiciousness that urged the author of the Naradha to introduce in the abundance of jewelled bangles the bangle of conch. From the afore said conception of slipping as also from the suggestion of a broken condition to be supplied from the context the idea of auspiciousness has suffered, with the result that the attainments of the hermits which dictated the introduction of Sarasvati in the hermitage have been negatived by the allied conception of her widowhood. Should one attempt a justification by construing it as a part of the उत्प्रेक्षा, it would not stand. For the potency of the उत्प्रेक्षा has been exhausted in the ascription of the material conch bangle to the spiritual Sarasvati. Hence, it is clear that even admitting the prevalence of the conch bangle in Bāna Bhaṭṭa's time (7th century A.D.) in his country (Behar) it was certainly not in the way in which we find it introduced in the Naradha. The latter is typically Bengali. Next, in consideration of Bāna Bhaṭṭa's extensive travels (for which his own admission in the Harsacharita is the authority) and the peculiar association of Sarasvati and conch bangles with Bengal, it would not be unfair to connect his introduction of the conch bangle with the influence of his acquaintance (however imperfect) with Bengal. Or, this may have been influenced by the Mahābhārata. Thus our position is unaffected from first to last, and our poet (Sribhāṣa) was not only an inhabitant of the country of conch bangles, but was also conversant with the art, as evidenced in the following extract —

ताराशद्धविलोपकस्य जलजं तीदण्डियो भिन्दत.
सारम्भं चलता करेण निविदां निष्पीडनां लभ्मितः ।
खदाधोंपहृतास्युक्ष्युजरजोजम्यालपाणडमय·
चतुद्गित्तुकरपत्रतामिह घदम्भस्तं गतोऽधों विषु॥(XIX.57)

the conch bangle is to show their alien connection, and thus Bengal also may come This is possible, and desirable too,—possible, because Arjuna while out on pilgrimage wandered through many countries and in the course of his wanderings went to Bengal also (42) and was acquainted with the practices of the place —desirable, because by creating the impression of a distant residence it would greatly contribute to the security of the disguised life, or, a combination of the practices of two distinct provinces, such as a bunch of bangles on the arm and conch bangles on the wrists, through a vagueness about residence, would the more strengthen that contribution A side question also is possible here, and that is—If the conch bangle were not current in Virāṭa, how could Arjuna procure it there ? To this we reply—The matter is not directly opposed to the principle of commerce, nor is there any justification for the belief that conch artisans were scarce in a flourishing city like Virāṭa Further, it would not be an unreasonable supposition that in consequence of the extreme hardness of the incognito life, the subject was uppermost in the mind of the Pāṇḍavas and they had long been preparing themselves for it

The place of the Kedambarī is the picture of a hermitage The connection of conch bangles there is this ‘In the hermitage here and there were lying morsels of lotus stalks half swallowed by young elephants, which gave one the impression that they were conch bangles slipped out of the hands of Goddess Sarasvatī’—(The Parrot’s speech) For the all-white Sarasvatī such an ornament—the conch bangle—is most suited and natural So the poet’s conception in that respect is very nice indeed But side by side with this an element of distaste also is there That is the poet’s ascription of slipping (from the hand) to the conch bangle For, the

(42) भद्रवद्वचिल्पु यानि तीर्थानि कानिचित् ।

जगाम तानि मत्वांगि पुण्यान्यायतरानि च ॥ १८०पर्वा २१५ ९)

conch bangle is never worn in a way that would make slipping possible. Then, there is always associated with the conch bangle an idea of auspiciousness that urged the author of the Naradha to introduce in the abundance of jewelled bangles the bangle of conch. From the afore said conception of slipping as also from the suggestion of a broken condition to be supplied from the context the idea of auspiciousness has suffered with the result that the attainments of the hermits which dictated the introduction of Sarasvati in the hermitage have been negatived by the allied conception of her widowhood. Should one attempt a justification by construing it as a part of the उत्प्रेक्षा, it would not stand. For the potency of the उत्प्रेक्षा has been exhausted in the ascription of the material conch bangle to the spiritual Sarasvati. Hence, it is clear that even admitting the prevalence of the conch bangle in Bana Bhatta's time (7th century A.D.) in his country (Bihar) it was certainly not in the way in which we find it introduced in the Naradha. The latter is typically Bengali. Next, in consideration of Bana Bhatta's extensive travels (for which his own admission in the Harṣacharita is the authority) and the peculiar association of Sarasvati and conch bangles with Bengal, it would not be unfair to connect his introduction of the conch bangle with the influence of his acquaintance (however imperfect) with Bengal. Or, this may have been influenced by the Mahābhārata. Thus our position is unaffected from first to last, and our poet (Śriharṣa) was not only an inhabitant of the country of conch bangles, but was also conversant with the art, as evidenced in the following extract —

ताराशङ्कविलोपकस्य जलजं तीक्ष्णतिव्यो मिन्दतः
सारमभं चलता करेण निविडां निष्पीडना लम्भित ।
छद्माधौं पहुताम्बुद्धजोजम्बालपाण्डुभव
चुद्धुङ्गित्वरपत्रतामिह घद्मस्तं गतोऽधौं विधु ॥(XIX 57)

Purport—The stars have disappeared. Lotuses are in bloom. The half set moon, hard pressed by the rays of the rising sun, appears like the conch cutter's saw white with conch dusts turned into clay by contact with water brought for facilitating the task of incision.

Devotion to the Sarasvata *mantra* after the Tantra also points to Bengal. For, Bengal is not simply the great centre of Tantra it is its nursery. The influence of this *tantra* is fully reflected in our poet's character too. The realisation of the Chintamani *mantra* is the effect of that same. This finds allusion in XIV. 88—90 of the Naisadha (43).

An examination into the names of Śrīharṣa's works—the names are our only resort in the absence of the named—also points to the same conclusion of his connection with Gauḍa or Bengal. For, besides the Naisadha and the Khandanakhanda, Śrīharṣa is the author of a good many other works. Their names (so far as we know from their mention in the concluding verses of the canto, and in the Khandanakhanda) are—Sthairyavichara, Vijayapraśasti, Gaudorvīśakulaprasasti, Arṇava-varnana, Chhinda-(Chhanda) prasasti, Śivasakti siddhi, Nṛpa—(Nava—) SahasauLachanta, and Iṣvarābhisandhi. Of

(43) अवामावानाधे सर्वमुभयाकारधटनादू
द्विवाभूतं रूपं भगवदभिधेयं नवात् यत्।
तदन्तर्मन्त्रे मे स्मरहरमय सेन्दुममलं
निराकार शश्वजप नरपते सिद्ध्यतु स ते ॥
सर्वादीणरसाशृतस्तिमितया वाचा स वाचस्पति.
स ल्वर्गीयं मूर्गादशामर्पि वशीकारात्य मारायते ।
यस्मै स स्पृहयत्यनेन स तदेवानोति किं भूयसा
येनाय हृश्ये कृत. सुकृतिना मन्मन्त्रचिन्तामणि ॥
पुष्टैरभ्यर्चं गन्धातिभिरपि उभयाश्चास्त्रसेन मां चे-
क्षियोन्तर्हां मन्त्रमूर्ति जपति मयि मर्ति न्यस्य मध्येव नक्तः ।
तत्प्राप्ते बत्सरान्ते शिरसि करमसौ यस्य कस्यापि धेच
सोऽपि इडोकानकाण्डे रचयति गच्छिरान् कौतुक दद्यमस्या ॥

these, the relation of the Gaudorvis akulapraśasti to Gauḍa is obvious, and while, it may be noted, that we are disposed to understand by the term गौडोवीर्यश्च the Gauḍa kings in general, the commentator Gopinatha understood by it a particular king of Gauḍa—viz Vijayasena to whom we shall refer below In the Nṛpa—(Nava—)Sahasanka charita, the Sāhasanki, with Mallinatha and Narayana, is the name of a Gauḍa king, which however, is not conclusive as the same commentators have also observed that with some this Sāhasanka is Bhoja or Vikramaditya The Chinda (with its variant Chhindī) in the Chhinda—(Chhanda—) prasasti is, with commentators, the name of a king not localised. This, therefore, though not supporting our case, is neither opposed to it Or by accepting the variant चुद-प्रशस्ति all difficulty is solved Narayana has even done so and explained चुद् as a treatise on metre But on examination into the meaning and use of the word प्रशस्ति that reading does not appear to be appropriate The Aranya varṇana whose subject matter is obvious from the name would be most inappropriate to Bengal, though not improbable elsewhere As for the Vijayaprasasti, though the commentators (of course such as were available) are all silent on the point, the 'Vijaya,' assuredly, is the name of an individual—I mean a king For, to assign the meaning 'victory' would lead to an inaccuracy as observed above in connection with the Chhandiprasasti If, then, it is the name of a king, it is now for us to determine who the king might be, and of what country The history of the 12th century designates a Gauḍa king named Vijayasena—the father of the illustrious Vallalasena Vallala has referred to him in his work en titled 'Dānastigara' The time of Śribhaṭṭa too, on examination, appears to fall somewhere in the same century For Śribhaṭṭa in many places in his Khaṇḍana has refuted the arguments of the

author of the *Kusumāñjali*—Udayanacharya(44), who flourished in the 10th century (45) And Gangeśa Upādhyāya in his *Tattvachintamani* has refuted the arguments of Śrihara as embodied in the *Khaṇḍana* (46) His time has been ascertained to be the 13th century (47) Thus the two ends of Śrihara's time being limited, the convention of old writers that they never write on modern works by allowing a reasonable margin on both sides will present something like the same That Śrihara was never anterior to Vijayasena nor even posterior is testified to by the manner of Gopinatha's specification already referred to Viewed in this light, the 'Vijayaprasasti' too favours the Bengal connection of the author. The *Sivasakti siddhi*, as appears from the title, treats of a subject bearing on the Tantra, and none need be told of the sway which the *Tantra* holds over Bengal. The subject matter of the remaining works is alien, as is manifest from the names, and so not a matter for the present consideration.

Even after this determination of the poet's country one might say that this is conclusive in so far as it proves that he was an inhabitant of Bengal Until, therefore, it is definitely shown that his mother tongue was Bengali, one cannot be convinced that he was a Bengali in the full sense of the term, I mean one born with the instincts of a Bengali The question is the more urgent, as there already exists a tradition that

(44) For reference, see such places as “तदिदमाहुः ‘प्रमाणवन्त्यहृष्टनि
कल्प्यानि सुगृह्ण्यपि’ इति । तस्मात्—”; “द्वितीयल्लु व्याधातोद्वासम्भवी
‘परस्तरविरोधे हि न प्रकाशान्तरेऽर्थात्’ इति”; and “तस्माद्द्वासमित्यप्प-
रिमव्रथ न सलु दुष्टया । त्वद्गायवान्यवाकारमश्चरणि क्षियन्त्यपि ॥”

(45) Thus his own word—

तर्कस्वराद्दक्षयमिते बर्तीते तु शकान्तरः ।

वपूदयनधके सुरोर्वा द्वजावर्णीम् ॥ बाला 906 (A. D. 984)

(46) So he says ‘इति सगृहनकारमतमप्यकास्तम्’

(47) See Rajendranath Ghosh's Introduction to his 'Navayanyāya'

connects his nativity with Kanouj and only his domicile with Bengal. The solution will be easy from the mode of his pronunciation noticeable in the poem. It is a well known fact that every vernacular has its own way of pronunciation in respect of certain letters, and Sanskrit which is no longer a spoken language is completely at the mercy of the Vernacular (mother tongue) in this respect. The Bengali tongue, it should be known, observes no distinction in the pronunciation of the three sibilants (শু, প, স), the letters শ, প and য (the last when it begins a word) are in Bengali invariably pronounced like ন, ব and জ respectively, the প in ক্ষ is treated invariably as খ, the ত্রিসূর্গ is conspicuous by shortness, and there are other such peculiarities holding the Bengali tongue as distinct from others. This trend of our poet has revealed itself through his alliterations. Our poet is exceedingly fond of alliteration. There is hardly a verse where alliteration has not its share, and in most places it partakes of the character of an analogue (যমক) and so cannot be slighted. This fondness of our poet for alliteration or any verbal feat having transcended his poetry has made itself felt even in his philosophy. Two quotations are made from the Khandanakhaṇḍa—

- (1) নদৈত্যুতেস্তাবদু চাধ প্রব্লক্ষত ক্ষত ।
নানুযানাদি ত কর্তৃ তথাপি ক্ষমতে মত ॥
শ্রদ্ধৈনাগমনাসীরে সাধু সা ধু-বতী পরানু ।
সেবাংমহার্জযল্যর্থাপত্তিপত্তি পরম্পরা ॥
- (2) সমস্তলোকণাঞ্চকমন্ত্যমাশ্রিত্য নৃত্যতো ।
কা তদস্তু গতিস্তচদ্বম্মুপীব্যবহারযা ॥

Under such circumstances we may reasonably conclude that, wherever the adoption of the Bengali mode of pronunciation gives us prominent cases of alliterations, analogue hidden or otherwise, that is there the pronunciation intended

by the poet. The truth of this will be ascertained from the following illustrations —

- 1 ए प स—अमी ततस्तस्य विभूपिनं सितं (I-57), अयोगभाजाऽपि नृपस्य पश्यता(I—100 , सखा सखायः स्मरदश्वो मम (I—136), कटु कीटादशनःसत क्षित् (II—4), अज्ञासिपु खीर्णशुवालिशास्त (X—32), वालामभाषत सभासत-तङ्गलमा (XI—16), अश्वैरस्वैरवेगैः (XII—100), नाश्नाति ज्ञाति हा मोहात् (XVII—41) ज्ञानस्पर्धान्तरा मौतमानशे मानसेचिनी (XX—13), विक्राणि विद्वाणितवान् पितृभ्यः (XXII—50).
- 2 ज, य—मनस्तु यं नोऽन्नतु जातु यातु (III—59), उपेयमाधुर्यं मधैर्यसज्जि (VI—93), मनुष्यजन्मन्यपि यन्मनो जने (IX—34 , यातु ततो जात न यातुधान (X—11), तद-पञ्चजन्मा यन्मादत् (XI—39), जागर्ति यग्नेश्वरः (XII—38), यज्ञयूपधनो जज्ञौ XXII—172).
- 3 ण, न—पुण्येन मन्ये पुनरयजन्म (VIII—33 , स्फुरद्दिग्न-नन्दमहाण्यैनवैः (XII - 2), अमूनि मन्येऽमरानिर्भरिष्यता (XXII—21)
- 4 व, व—कुलं सुधांयोवर्द्धलं वदन् यहु (I—110), स्मरहरः विमुं वुभुजं विभु. (IV—60) वुवुधिर विवुधेद्रा. (V—60), विविवुयी वुवुधेन (V—72), स विलोक्य वालाम् (VI—13), सांविमृति श्रो॥त्रयविभ्रमं यत् (VII—100 क्षये जगद्वीवपिव्यं छिवं वदन् (IX—124), ।
- 5 क्ष—नलस्य च स्वस्य च सख्यमीक्षते , I—38), अभिख्या भिक्षाधुना (VII—104), तद सौख्यलदयः XI—108), भ्राचख्यौ चाक्षिन्नमुम् (XVII—92), सख्यौ सक्तौमभावेऽपि (XX—129)

6. विसर्ग (The peculiarity attaching to the विसर्ग is prominent in the analogue alone Hence that alone is considered here)—

आगत्य भूतः सकलो भवत्या भावप्रतीत्या गुणलोभवत्याः (III-115)
 तं संचरदत्यद्दुःमृगस्यनाभि-कस्तूरिकासौरभवासनाभि- (XXII-86)
 Miscellaneous—स रशिरासीन्महसां महोज्ज्वलः (I - 1)
 असंबरे शम्वरवैरविक्रमे (I-53), अवाह्नमिज्यते
 (II-78), आसन्ननायकविषयणमुखानुमेय (XI-12),
 पद्म-जसख्याशिक्षा (XI-102), सर्णीपदसुचिन्हा थी (XX-58)
 अद्भुतसज्जशयम् (XXII-2).

Like his fondness for alliteration his fondness for me too is so distinctly manifest in the Naishadha, that may be called a regular mania of the poet. A few examples may be quoted :—

धार्ये कथद्दुरमहंभवत्या वियद्विहारी वसुधैकगत्या (III 15)
 अरणक्षशद्दुर्यमिच्चारहेतुर्वर्णी न वेदा यदि सत्तु के तु ।
 (III-78) ।

अपां हि तृप्ताय न वारिधारा स्वादु. सुगन्धिः स्वदते तुपारा ।
 (III-93) ।

तं कापि मेन समरमेव कन्या मेजे मनोभूवशभूयमन्या ।
 . VIII-6) ।

जाता न वित्ते न गुणे न काम सौन्दर्ये एव प्रवणः स
 वामः । (X-13) ।

मध्येसर्वं सावततार वाला गन्धर्वविद्याधरकरणमाचा ।
 त्रयीमयीभूतवलीविभङ्गा साहित्यनिर्वर्तितद्वकरङ्गा ॥ X-73)

Such examples are profuse, not only in the Naishadha, but also in the Khandana so poor in verses. It is therefore no wonder that the influence of the Bengali tongue will be perceived in this rhyme too. Thus we have—

वचसामपि गोचरो न यः स तमानदमधिन्दत द्विजः । (II-1)
 आस्थितावितयतागुणपाशस्त्वादशा स विदुपा दुरपासः । V-130)
 तस्मिन् विषयार्थेपथात्तपातं तदद्वरागच्छुरितं निराच्य ।
 विस्मेरतामापुरघिस्मरन्त्य. चित्तं मिथः कन्दुकमिन्दुमुख्यः ॥
 (VI-42)

द्यायामु रुं भुधि वीक्ष्य तस्य फलं दयोरानग्निर महिषः
 (VI—43) ।

चन्द्रानिकैतनमुखचन्द्रिरुणाणां दरायतं तत्किरण द् घनान म् ।
 (VII—41)

यस्य कर्तिरुदायति स्म सा कर्तिर्वितिधित्यीयिनी
 स्वसा । (XVIII—22)

कर्तवीर्यमिदुणे दणस्ये रेणुकेय मरता सुखनाश्ये ।
 (XXI—68)

With regard to this question of pronunciation one might say that deviations too are observable in the Naradha. Such a one is च यं ..चयम् (See the first half of the concluding verses of the cantos) Or, contending that this forms part of the concluding verse of a canto and the concluding verses have already been shown to be spurious, and also, the marks of the analogue (यमक) are not so conspicuous here, and hence negligible, there is another whose authority is unquestioned and where the marks of the analogue are also conspicuous in the extract—सुवर्यणां हि स्फुट-भावना या सा पूर्वकं फलभावनायाः । (XIV—7) How should that be explained ?

Reply.—The question is a little complex no doubt, but not insoluble. In the solution we should first see what is the extent of the analogue, I mean whether it is confined to भावना alone or 'या-या' also is to be included. If it is confined to भावना no difficulty arises. If 'या-या' also is to be included, then the question will be—How to solve the घिसर्ग? For it cannot be separated from the vowel, and if not separated the analogue (यमक) will suffer. The analogue difficulty is solved on admitting the Bengali pronunciation, but that very procedure will establish the Bengali pronunciation of the 'य' as well. Therefore, the analogue here is to be restricted to the भावना portion only and the Bengali pronunciation of य is intact.

Conclusive as the above evidences are in establishing the Bengali origin of the poet, doubts on some minor points are still not unlikely. Such are—(1) his mother's strange name 'Māmalladevi', (2) the addition of 'Misra' after his name as found at the end of some chapters of his Khaṇḍanakhādya, (3) the traces, in many places in his Naṭṣadha and Khaṇḍanakhādya, of his acquaintance with Pāṇini (48), (4) his high honours at the hands of the King of Kanouj (foot-note 5), and (5) the appreciation of his poem by scholars in Kashmir (foot note (1)—canto XVI). So these too require to be cleared.

The first doubt attaches to a name and our reply to this is that the name is no authority. Sridharāchārya was a Bengali (which is an established fact), yet his mother's name was 'Achchhokā'. Besides, if the name 'Māmalladevi' is not current in Bengal, neither is it in other countries. So it is not a contrary point. Even supposing it to have a foreign origin, that would be no bar to our conclusion, for even in the modern age of narrowed nationalities instances are not rare of a Bengali being named Jangilal or a Hindusthani Venkatachari. About the second point, the surname 'Misra' is no proof of one's being a non-Bengali. For, it was so before, and even now many Bengalis are found with 'Misra' for their surname. With regard to the third point, viz acquaintance with Pāṇini, our reply is that the currency of Pāṇini in the Rajshahi district (Bengal) dates from olden times. The Bhāṣāvṛtti of Pāṇini is current only in Bengal. Its author Purushottam was a Bengali. The saying goes that it was written at the instance of King Lakshman Sen of Gauḍa. Also, the Dhātuvṛtti, Dhātupradīpa,

(48) इह किमुपसि पृच्छारासिकिशब्दरूप-प्रतिनियमितवाचा वायस्सेनैष पृष्ठः ।

भग फणिभवशास्त्रे तातड़ स्थानिनौ काविति विहितुहीवागुच्चः कोकि
लोऽभूतः॥ (XX-60). Also foot-note (4) and (5)

Tantrapradipa and Kāśikā-vivarana-panchikā (which last goes by the name Nyāsa—of course incomplete) have all been discovered by the Rajshahi Varendra Society and that in Bengal. Besides, the celebrated Naiyāyika Gadādhara Bhattacharya, a Bengali, has in many places in his glosses quoted *sūtras* from Paṇini. As for the last two points relating to Kanyakubja and Kashmir, these are no proofs to the contrary. It is the Indian adage which says विद्वान् सर्वत्र पूज्यते (The learned are honoured everywhere). Honouring the poet is a time honoured custom in India. Distance was never an impediment to it.

My conclusion regarding the Bengali origin of Sriharṣa finds support in two ancient works also. Rājasekhara Suri in his Prabandhakosha (Hariharaprabandha) says about Harihara that he was descended from Sriharṣa and belonged to Gauḍa (49), and Vidyāpati Thakkura—of nearly the same age—says in an anecdote of his Puruṣapariṇkṣā that Sriharṣa was a native of Gauda. The anecdote in brief is this—

In the country of Gauḍa there lived a poet and scholar named Sriharṣa. He composed a poem entitled Nalacharita and to show it to the Pandits for their approval went to Benares. There he read it to a Pandit named Koka. Koka went on hearing, but passed no remark though a greater part of the book had been read to him. Sriharṣa then asked him: 'Perhaps you are not listening'. Koka said, 'Oh yes, I am. But I reserve my opinion until I hear the whole, when I shall be in a position to judge the work. Afterwards, when the whole had been read, he gave his views and sent him away. (50)

(49) 'गौडदेशीय.' इति 'श्रीहर्षवंशे हरिहरो गौडदेशः' इति ।

(50) बभूव गौडविषये श्रीहर्षो नाम कविपण्डितः । स च नलचरिताभिधानं काव्यं
कृत्वा * * * तत्काल्यं दर्शयन्तु पण्डितमण्डलीमुहित्य वाराणसी जगाम ।
तत्र च कोक्तनामानं पण्डितं श्रावयामास । * * * श्रीहर्षस्तु तमनुगच्छन्
पठति प्रत्यहम् । तदुसरं किमपि नामोति । एष्वा श्रीहर्षोक्तम् । आर्य-

I shall conclude this second point of my article with an examination into the views (1) of those who by the authority of Rajasekhara Suri's Prabandhakosa (referred to above) say that Srihara was a Pandit at the court of Jayantachandra (otherwise called Jayachandra and Jayachchandra), king of Benares, and at that time Kanouj and Benares were under one rule (51) and so he was a native of Benares or Kanouj, (2) of those who resting on the tradition relating to Adisur, king of Bengal, say that he was a native of Kanouj, having subsequently transferred his residence to Bengal, and (3) of those who on the strength of the tradition which represents him as a nephew (sister's son) of Mammata believe that he was a Kashmiri.

With regard to the first view the question is—Had Srihara been a native of Benares or Kanouj, could he, consistently, have passed over the king of his own country (Benares or Kanouj) and written a chanta or a prasasti of the king of a distant country (Gauḍa)? If it be said that his Vijayaprassati refers not to Vijayasen, king of Gauda, but to Vijayachandra, father of Jayantachandra, even then his connection with Gauḍa (shown above) as revealed in the names of his other works is not solved. Besides, we are

महाकाव्ये कृतश्रमोऽहम् । उत्परीक्षाप्यं त्वामुद्दिश्य तु द्वा स्वेदीयवात्सल्येन
च महतो दूरादागतोऽसि । * * * भवान्न निन्दातन चाभिनन्दिति । तन्मन्ये
कर्णमेव नाप्यर्थोत । शोक उवाच । आ कथमह कर्णं नाप्यामि । किन्तु
सम्पूर्णं श्रुत्वा शब्दर्थ्योरुहापोहेन सन्दर्भशुद्धिं ज्ञात्वा विशेषं वस्त्वामि ।
कोकपणितस्त्वय काव्यस्य गुणान् प्रस्तुत्य दोषान् समाधाय विशेषानु-
दोध्य स ध्रीहपक्विराज दृष्टमनस कृत्वा गृहं प्रस्थापयामास । (Vidyapati's Purusapankti)

(51) Thus Purusapankti a—प्रस्तुति भागीरथीतीरो कान्त्यकुञ्ज नाम नरा म् ।
तथा द्वाशीश्वरो जयचन्द्रो राजा वभू । Also तत कापि गत्वा भुजदर्शण
पौरुषमजयमीति परामृश्य स तुमार कान्त्यकुञ्ज नाम जनपद जगाम । तथा
च श्रीजयचन्द्रनाम्नो राजे काशीश्वरस्य द्वभावपिषाट्या दर्शन चक्षर ।

still in darkness as to why he should pass over one he is directly concerned with—I mean Jayachandra or Jayanta chandra—in favour of his father Vijayachandra. Again, all are not agreed about the name of Jayachandra's father. According to Rājāśekhara his father's name was Govinda chandra. With others, Govindachandra was the name of his grandfather. Moreover, the verse that is often quoted in support of the Vijayachandra view (52) has nothing therein to show that it exclusively refers to Vijayachandra and not to Jayachandra. For while the 'son of Govinda' (गोविन्दनन्दन) in the verse means in one view Vijayachandra, it may in the other mean Jayachandra as well. In this way, as also from the fact that at the time of Vijayachandra's expedition (which is said to be the occasion for the verse) Śrīharṣa was a boy (this, too, is the version of the same party), and for a boy a verse like the above would appear, if not from the point of composition, at least from the point of conception, unnatural, its reference to Vijayachandra is hard to establish. To this if we add the view of the Prabardhaka, the matter becomes altogether different. There, when Śrīharṣa returned equipped with scholarship for the requital of his father's disgrace, he hailed Jayantachandra with that verse. Thus the connection of the 'Vijayapraśasti' with Vijayachandra can in no way be entertained, and the inconsistency about the title of the book remains unsolved as before. Moreover, in that view where is the solution of those other points (discussed in this paper) that go to establish the Bengali character? Above all, the same authority of Rājāśekhara's Prabandha kosa whose first part 'Śrīharṣa Vidyadhara Jayantachandra Prabandha' by reason of its presenting Śrīharṣa as a member

(52) गोविन्दनन्दनतया च चतु ध्रिया च मार्म मन्त्रे कुरु । कामधिय तरुण ।

अस्मीकरोति जाता वित्ते स्मरस्थी खी जन पुनरनेन विधीयते खा ॥

(53) See footnote (49)

of the court of Jayantachandra has been made the basis of establishing Srihara's non Bengali origin, by the distinct mention, in its last part 'Harihara prabandha', of the expression 'Harihara in the line of Srihara was a Gaudiya', only confirms our own view about the poet, viz that he was a Bengali.

With regard to the second view, based on the tradition about Adisur, the first question would be how far it would be possible for a foreigner having come to a place at an advanced age to completely identify himself with it, even to the extent of forgetting the trends of his mother tongue. Secondly, for a ritualistic Brāhmaṇa (for Adisur brought the five Brāhmaṇas for the performance of a sacrifice) intensive studies of poesy and philosophy do not, from the point of taste and leisure, commune to reason. Thirdly, from our examination of the titles of Srihara's works we nowhere find any reference to Virasimha who sent him to Bengal. How is this to be explained? Fourthly, the family registers (*कुलपत्रकास*) give the name of Srihara's father as Tithimedhā,—different from Hirī or Srihira. Fifthly, according to genealogist Vansivadan Vidyaratna, it was some ancestor of Srihara and not Srihara himself who was among the five Brāhmaṇas that hailed from Kanouj. This view, therefore, in spite of its conformity to the Gauda connection revealed in the works as aforesaid, cannot be accepted as tenable.

As regards the third view the first objection would come from the historians, who contradict the tradition where it relates to our poet's interview with the rhetorician by saying that the two were never contemporary. Secondly, it is hard to reconcile how when a distinguished Kashmirian critic like Mammata could not accord his approbation, the poem could still be given the credentials of one having won laurels at the learned assembly of Kashmir. Thirdly, the glorification in the

Kashmir honours, as also the alien notion attaching to the direct mention of Kashmir, would naturally expect one to connect these honours with impartial judges of a foreign land. Lastly, this offers no solution of the points going to prove a different view as shown above.

From the aforesaid examination of the three views we come to the following conclusions— (1) In spite of the possibility of his having lived in the court of the king of Kāśī or Kanouj, Śrīhara was never a native of either of those places. (2) Śrīhara in question was never among the five Brāhmaṇas reported to have come from Kanouj, and the view that an ancestor of our Śrīhara hailed from Kanouj does not mar our position whose main point is that the author of the Naradha was born with the instincts of a Bengali, for the distance of even two or three removes in a foreign land with all communication cut off with one's own country is sufficient for identification with the new place. (3) The alleged relationship between Mammata and our poet, coupled with the peculiar formation of the name मामल्लदेवी which, according to some, approximates a Kashmirian name, would at best establish his Kashmir connection on the mother's side, which, considering the peculiar relationship holding between Kashmir and Bengal in those days and comparative relaxation of marriage restrictions, would be no bar to his Bengal connection on the father's side, and that establishes our point.

VI—INDIAN DRAMATURGY.

(By P. N. PATANKAR)—9-3-12

Like most of the स्मृतिः, नोतिशाखः, पुराणः &c., the नाट्यशाखा going under the name of भरत seems to be an enlargement of an original briefer work in the form of सूत्रः, भवभूति actually speaks of a तौयंत्रिक सूत्र by भरत. The नाट्यशाखा speaks of भरत as the lecturer to an assemblage of ऋषिः and contains many verses professedly current in the mouths of the representatives of the particular branches of thought or art with reference to which they are quoted.

Though traceable to meanest performances like picture scenes, pantomimes and puppet shows—suggested by the etymology of words like सूत्रधार, and corroborated by existing remnants of those crude types yet to be seen in the less refined quarters of the country,—the drama in the early age to which we might trace the नाट्यशाखा had reached a stage of undoubted perfection so far as the detail of acting as well as decorative appurtenances went, to say nothing of the poetic art and the study of poesy in its abstrusest details.

The arts connected with the representation of the drama represent of course the type of refinement the society had reached. From the practical aspects of engineering applied to architecture, the various industries that supplied the means and materials of stage arrangements and decorations to the construction of musical instruments of a large variety of shapes and structures, the mind and hand of man can both be easily seen as hardly inferior to the perfections of any society one might imagine either past or present.

If effectual performance is the end of dramatic representation, भरत's teachings can never be excelled by any thinkers and students of the science and art of dramaturgy.

The नाट्य therefore has been appropriately raised to the dignity of a वेद and in the early beliefs about the source of anything that is perfect in its conception or virtue, this वेद has been rightly attributed to ब्रह्मन् himself, just in the same way that that god was the inspirer of the great वाल्मीकि in singing the story of राम.

भरत obtained the नाट्यवेद and performed for the pleasure of the gods and demigods or demons representing their own exploits. The भृत्यरस्त्रs including गच्छवंs of heaven are his assistants and from them sprang a class of performers on the earth. They were esteemed by व्राज्यणs and नृपs and perpetuated the art in the world. जयदेव of the प्रसन्नराघव speaks of the actors as an inferior class to व्राज्यणs, the special terms indulgently allowed to be used by नटी and सूत्रधार towards each other as आर्य and आर्या might imply an inferiority, but the inferiority does not seem to have amounted to untouchableness in the festive dinners; मैत्रेय in the मृच्छकटिक is invited to dine at the सूत्रधार's, the सूत्रधार of the मुद्राराज्ञस allows a dinner to be given to व्राज्यण by his wife. Learning even in the sacred lures is not denied to that class, as can easily be gathered by reference to any of the known dramas.

As already hinted, the society for whom the नाटक was performed was of the most refined आर्य classes, and an adaptation to the taste of the time and the condition of the society is a principle that shows how perfect the ideals were both in the case of the Actors and that of the audience. Nor was this वेद denied to the शूद्र class. In the literal attitude of the भगवद्वीता (खियो वैश्यास्तथा शूद्रास्तेऽपि यान्ति परां गतिम), it was even intended for their enlightenment.

If poetic justice means anything, it is fully maintained in the सारथीय ideal of the नाट्य. The नाट्य must be an honest picture of existing phenomena (in the moral and

spiritual world more especially, the physical being often left to the imagination) and the possibilities from them. The drama *must have a moral aim*. What could be superior to the conception of the matter? Everything that would mislead, offend or corrupt is to be eschewed from the representation. Nothing could be more touching than the care of the guardian of the souls of the receptive spectators when he warns you against what may harm the sensibilities and thoughts of the innocent souls.

Unlike the modern ways a dramatic performance was not a very frequent affair. Only important occasions were availed of for the performance and usually the aspices of some powerful patron were sought by the profession. It was a solemn affair, not a mere entertainment. It was therefore commenced with proper 'pomp and circumstance' from the religious point of view. It was thus a quasi-religious performance. Worship and prayers and sacrificing preceded the representation and the effect could be expected to be correspondingly great.

The sage takes care to teach with the very elements and beginning with the units of measurement, he details, the construction of the theatre in a thoroughly practical and scientific spirit. It is interesting to note the principles of every art that bears on the author's main subject. Some of these will be treated further below.

Every care is taken to propitiate the spiritual powers from beginning to end of every main part of the whole business. The choice of place and time and persons in safeguarding the spiritual side in full keeping with the existing superstitions is enjoined and full practical directions given about the measurement material and structure with all the minor particulars required for the convenience of situations in the acting.

All materials required to make the apparatus needed for the scenes, the directions to construct the same, the personal decorations including costumes jewels, have been given in full detail, that throw immense light on the fashion of social life of a very important period of Aryan history. Lists of these are interesting in a variety of ways.

The drama involves poetries, music singing and dancing. The last as a matter of fact is intimately connected with the very idea of acting. The author has devoted abundant space and patience to the treatment of these four subjects. Each of these has given rise to different branches of study in later times. The साहित्यदर्पण treats fully of poetries including general poetry as well as particular. Technical works exist on singing and musical instruments especially the मृदंग—arts familiar in the courts of India. A reading of these would throw light on the obscurities in the understanding of the tunes of the songs in some of the older dramas as well as the nature of some technical terms that but for this as an original authority would be unintelligible. It is true that a thorough appreciation of the details is almost impossible, but the chapters on these subjects serve as a mine from which much valuable matter is discoverable.

The details of आभिनन्द (inclusive of the modulation of the voice) can never be surpassed. The observation both of the nicer shades of acting and of the corresponding effects is a matter belonging solely to the province of genius and in everyone of the above branches, the power of the Indian mind indicates the possibilities which set forth hidden treasures of the soul. Later authors could not give all the detail, that is too vast to follow but yet too valuable to be neglected.

It has been already said that Actors made a separate caste. Males and females both acted on the stage. Pro-

fessional female dancers and female singers are mentioned, but the वेश्या or harlot class must be considered as a distinct one from the भरत caste. The dancing girls are even spoken of as high born.

The acting of female parts by male persons and vice versa was in vogue to a little extent. But the sexes seem most usually to play their own parts, the females belonging to the भरत caste of course being the female players. While the वेश्या or गणिका is a separate class altogether, though she was notwithstanding her profession held respectable in the social scale. वसन्तसंना's mansion and honourable position are a sufficient instance in point.

For the history of language, of society and of different peoples in the geographical situations, much research is possible with the help of भरत's नाम्यशास्त्र. Names of countries, of peoples, of particular features and fashions among the variety of nationalities are matters of supreme interest to the student of history. The study of prosody given here will suggest the stages in the history of Sanskrit and Prakrt that will be very useful in determining the periods of development or otherwise in the variety of languages described or illustrated. There are numerous miscellaneous features that deserve attention.

The worship of gods can very nearly be traced as mediaeval between Vedic worship and later image worship, a kind of the गृह्य rites with the later and local superstitions गणपति and सहागणपति in their later characters are nowhere, while the now neglected ब्रह्मन् as a deity worshipped in image is highly prominent.

नक्षत्रः seem to have been the common expression of popular astronomy instead of the more popular राशिः of the later times.

Numbers of miscellaneous points may be noted. सरस्वती is spoken of as दृरिप्रिया, कपायवन्धन is an ill omen नाट्यपुडी used in modern worship seems to have had an early origin, श्रमधुकर्म has been prescribed for particular purposes. While technical terms belonging to the fine arts occur in innumerable details and form in themselves an indication of the taste and intellectual development of the age represented in the work.

The नाटक is of course the principal subject. The abstract as well as concrete features of the subject find perfect expression here and the history of the Sanskrit drama can start from this work as the most valuable material. As already noted, the drama being a काव्य, भरत has detailed all the characteristics of the काव्य on which later writers on the subject have amply drawn to make their own systems.

There is some question with regard to the unities.— But the idea of the Greek unities is almost absent because of the free spirit in which the Indian drama was conceived and constructed. The question has been started with the assumption that India owes something to Hellenic models in the art. The unities are naturally given up in so far as there may be no need for them, the Elizabethan drama in English did so and the Sanskrit drama did that in the early age.

Some early dramas have been mentioned in the नाट्यशास्त्र. Some are hinted later on by Patanjali. असूतमःयन, त्रिपुरदाह, बलिवन्धन, कंसघ एc. are instances.

The age of the writing of the नाट्यशास्त्र is an interesting question. There is no doubt that Kalidas had known it well. भवभूति did know, but he speaks of भरत as the तौरेंत्रिवसुत्कार. भवभूति has made use of the poetic fact of the machinery of the अप्स्तरसूत्र being employed by भरत. Worship of ब्रह्मन् is mentioned by कालिदास. The triad of ब्रह्मन्, विष्णु and महादेव has been recognised. The point of नक्षत्रs being used for sacred purposes and not राशिः lends data in inferring the date. We must at any rate go behind कालिदास, i. e. behind the fifth century in settling the date of the work.

A more careful and patient study will enable one to develop all these subjects more fully.